

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE REV. W. M. CLOW, D.D., Professor of Ethics in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, has written a book on *The Christian Message in the Light of the War* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d.). We pass at once to the chapter entitled 'The Eternal Destiny of the Fallen.' All the other chapters are interesting, but this is urgent. If Professor CLOW can tell us what the eternal destiny of the fallen is—if he can tell us in such a way that we shall be able to tell others, and set their mind at rest, our own conscience remaining at rest also—there is no greater service that he can do for us.

Now it is encouraging to find that he begins with three undeniable facts. There are three truths about the destiny of the fallen, he says, of which there is no doubt. And they are fundamental. The first is the immortality of the soul. The second is judgment to come. The third is that we are saved, not by works, but by faith in God, our Redeemer.

Professor CLOW does not mean to say that nobody denies these facts. He means that no one denies them who has hope in Christ. And he has written his book for those who have that hope. No one, he says, who knows Christ denies the immortality of the soul. Surely not. It is the very minimum of Christian faith. Is it

Christian at all? Is it of faith? The immortality of the soul!—the Christian belief is much more than immortality. It is eternal life. And it is much more than the eternal life of the soul. It is the eternal life of the whole personality.

Here is one fact then with which we can enter the house of mourning. The next fact is that there is 'a judgment to come.' Is Professor CLOW as sure of that? He is just as sure, though he admits that mankind was longer in securing it. He goes back to Daniel for it: 'Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' That is its first clear expression in the Bible. From Daniel he goes to Christ, with whom judgment to come is ever the inevitable issue. He goes from Christ to St. Paul: 'We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.' He goes to the Pauline atmosphere of the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment.' Wherever he goes he finds the revelation, once gained, firmly held. He is content with that.

Are we all content? Can we go with the same confidence to the mourner and say, 'Your son who has fallen is before the judgment seat of God



that he may receive the things done in his body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad'? If we are sure of the fact, are we sure of the consolation?

---

We are sure that there is no consolation whatever in it. There is no comfort in it for one in ten of the fathers and mothers whose sons have fallen in the war. There is no consolation for one in fifty. There is no consolation for a single father or a single mother of all the young men who have fallen. For they know their sons.

---

It is not that they know their sons were bad. No mother will say that, or allow another to say it. There is a pertinent passage in *The Ring and the Book*. Pompilia tells the story of her treatment at the hands of a brutal and hideous husband. She tells it with gentleness and an unconquerable charity. And she brings the story to an end with the simple words, 'I could not love him, *but his mother did.*'

---

No mother will say that her son was bad. But the judgment of God! The things done in the body! Before the judgment of the living God what mother will be confident that the things done by her son in the body deserve the promise of everlasting life?

---

There is a popular way of meeting the difficulty. It seems to be popular in the pulpit; it is very popular with the poets. The evil of a life, be it little or great, is cancelled by the one supreme act of sacrifice at the end of it.

---

Can we use it? Can we conscientiously carry that comfort to the mourner? Do we believe it? Professor CLOW does not believe it, though he says very little about it. But Principal FORSYTH does not believe it and says so most emphatically.

---

At the same time as Professor CLOW's book appeared there was published a volume by the Rev. P. T. FORSYTH, D.D., Principal of Hackney

College, Hampstead, with the title of *This Life and the Next* (Macmillan; 4s. net). In that book, in the chapter entitled 'De Mortuis,' Principal FORSYTH says: 'At a time like the present the interest of countless bereaved hearts is not in immortality for themselves, but for those who have been caught away either unfulfilled, or unprepared, or worse than unprepared, by the wickedness of war. What do our ideas of the unseen warrant us to say to the bleeding hearts and fearful minds of those left upon earth? May we say in consolation to the bereaved that every martyr patriot goes straight from the field of death to the side of the Saviour? May we say that in the way of comfort; as if a death for a great cause, to whose side the man sprang at a patriotic call, wiped out the vices of a lifetime, or the betrayal of innocent hearts? We could say no such thing.'

---

But Professor CLOW had three foundation truths to build on. What was the third? 'The third truth is that we are saved, not by our works, but by faith in God, our Redeemer. No human sanctity earns the right to enter in through the gates into the city. In the white light of God's holiness every man's life stands out flawed and spotted. Before God's throne we must all take our stand with that poor castaway, of whom it was written:

Owning her weakness,  
Her evil behaviour,  
And leaving with meekness  
Her sins to her Saviour.'

---

That seems to alter the situation. It seems to introduce us into a different world. So then we are *not* judged according to the deeds done in the body. We are judged according to our faith in Christ. Professor CLOW seems to say so. For, from this point, without a word about the contradiction between the second truth and the third, he speaks of the men who have fallen only in their relation to Christ.

---

First, he says, there are 'those who have died



*with a confessed faith in Christ.* One of the outstanding facts has been the spontaneous rally made by members of all Christian communions. Every Church has its Roll of Honour, upon which are to be found the names of the flower of the flock. These had publicly confessed their faith, maintained their fellowship, and were growing in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ. They went forth as defenders of the kingdom of heaven. We are sure that as they yielded up their lives, they were persuaded that He was able to keep that which was committed to Him. They were faithful unto death, and we number them among those blessed dead who have died in the Lord, who now rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.'

Next, there are those 'who have died *with a latent faith in God.* There are some who have never made a profession of faith. They have been worshippers in the house of prayer, and have given some support to the objects of the Christian Church. But they have never identified themselves with its fellowship. They have sometimes been critical, and even careless, about the things that belong to their peace. Yet many of them have had a latent faith. They have had a deep conviction of the being and wisdom and love of God. They have cherished a silent and yet constraining reverence for Christ. That was born within them in their early years, when they repeated their simple prayers and sang the hymns of their childhood.'

'There is a record in Indian annals of two English officers, who were taken prisoners in a Mohammedan raid. They were not distinctively religious men. The Bible was a neglected book, and they lived without sharing the offices of Christian fellowship, and without the practice of prayer. They were offered their lives on the usual Mohammedan terms, that they would disown Christ and repeat the creed of Mahomet: "Great is Allah, and Mahomet is his prophet." As they faced this keen temptation their latent faith rose

up in power, and they met the demand with a clear denial. They bowed their heads to the stroke of death with the sheen of a new joy in that Lord whose Name was seldom upon their lips in life, but to whom they were witnesses in the hour of death.'

Then there are men who have '*an imperfect faith in God.* We all remember many who not only refused to confess Christ, but never had much concern as to what He could be to them. They spoke of the fellowship and worship of the Church with indifference, if not with scorn. The great thoughts of the Gospel which stir our souls to penitence and desire were nothing to them. But they cared with a deep interest for the things which Christ honoured and proclaimed. They revered righteousness and truth. They had a true sense of honour, and were filled with compassion for those in need. They were chivalrous in their help for the outcast and the man who is down. They were filled with a moral indignation at the wrongs of the poor. So when the deeds of hate and greed were done, when a merciless brutality wrought havoc among the defenceless, and a coarse and bestial sensuality ravaged the helpless of Flanders and of France, they rose up and left house, and parents, and wife and child for the kingdom of heaven's sake.'

The example is found in the Old Testament. It is the example of a woman. 'When the Israelites sent their two spies across Jordan they found a lodging in the house of Rahab the harlot. She was a woman of Canaan, and her life was dark with shame. Her knowledge of the God of Israel was dim and shadowy. Her conception of the mission of His people was dark and uncertain. Her ideal of life faltered at the very thought of purity. But she had faith enough to risk her all, and to hazard her life for the cause of the God of Israel. We find her name written in the great roll of honour of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as one whose faith, imperfect indeed, was counted to her for righteousness.'



Again, of those who have fallen there are men who 'died with a freshly born faith in God. They have been wilfully and openly defiant. They have never prayed. We need not uncover too rudely and barely the dark secrets of their lives, or describe the wild mutinies of their reckless years. Yet many of these men were wondrously pitiful in the hour of another's need, were strangely gentle in word and deed as they bore the wounded, were unselfish and loyal in their comradeship, and were nobly heroic in the saving of the lives of others at the cost of their own. In the last hour many of these men stepped out steadfastly to certain death in the power of a faith which was freshly born within their souls.'

'An American poet, John Hay, has told the story of Jim Bludso, the engineer of the *Prairie Belle*, a steamboat on the Mississippi River. He was a man of evil life, utterly careless of the obediences of purity. The *Prairie Belle* was an old worn-out vessel, and newer boats easily passed her in the race on the river. One night she was being driven at high pressure, not to be left too far behind. Fire broke out from under her boilers, and the whole vessel was enveloped in flame. Her head was turned toward the river bank, and the terrified passengers crowded into her bows. Bludso stood by his engines in the midst of the fire, and held her against the river bank until every other on board was saved. The poet closes his story with these lines:

He weren't no saint—but at jedgment  
I'd run my chance with Jim,  
'Longside of some pious gentleman  
That wouldn't shook hands with him.  
He seen his duty, a dead sure thing—  
And went for it thar and then;  
And Christ ain't going to be too hard  
On a man who died for men.'

What does Professor CLOW say to that? He questions the poet's theology. He denies that a man's evil can be 'atoned for or blotted out by a single heroic deed at the close of life.' But the

poet does not read deeply enough into the significance of this sacrifice of Jim Bludso. He does not discern that the man who stood by his engine while the flames wrapped him round as a winding sheet was a believer, dying for a faith which had been born within. He was a crude-minded, sin-laden, dim-visioned man; but he was moved and motived by Him who had died for men, and in that faith he followed in Christ's steps.

Are these all? No, there is still another class. There are those—but all that Professor CLOW says about them is: 'We leave them to the judgment of Him who knoweth all.'

The judgment of Him who knoweth all—who is that? It is *the Lord Jesus Christ*. In *The Record* for Thursday, 11th April 1918, there is a sermon by the Dean of Canterbury. It was preached in Canterbury Cathedral on Easter Day. Dr. Wace says that there is 'one certain thing' about those who have passed into the next world. It is certain about *all* of them. They remain in the gracious and living hands of Christ. They are subject to His power. They receive their ultimate destiny at His hands.

When, says the Dean of Canterbury, 'we pass into the unseen portion of life we, too, pass into a world in great measure unknown and obscure, but we do know one cardinal certainty. We need not be content with saying, as good men even without the Christian faith may say, that they are passing into the hands of God. They are going, we shall ourselves go, into the presence of One who is well known to us, into the presence of that Lord Jesus whose whole character and nature are familiar to us through the records of His life on earth, and through His final words as He passed from it. We and they are passing into the nearer presence of the gracious Master, Who said in His last hours, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would



have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." What need any Christian be concerned with beyond this, either for himself or for the beloved ones who pass from him? If we ourselves, or a friend of ours, were going into an unknown country, would not the best thing we could know about it be that we should be received by a friend whom we knew to be a man of all goodness and abundant power? That is what we know of *all who fall in this great battle day by day.*

---

Is there anything that we can do for those who have fallen? Is there anything that we can do for them now that they are dead? Yes, we can pray for them.

---

So says Dr. P. T. FORSYTH. And Dr. P. T. FORSYTH is the Principal of a Congregational College. He says that we can pray for the dead. He is very well aware that congregationalists have not been in the habit of praying for the dead. But he traces its discontinuance to ecclesiastical abuse. 'It would never have been lost but for the abuses of purgatory, masses, and the commerce which the Church made of a magical influence on another world. But we threw away too much when we made a clean sweep.'

---

What will the advantage be? We shall retain our hold on the unseen. Prayer, says Dr. FORSYTH, 'is our supreme link with the unseen—with which otherwise we have no practical relations. We should resume prayer for the dead, were it only to realize the unity of the Church and our fellowship with its invisible part. In Christ we cannot be cut off from our dead nor they from us wherever they be. And the contact is in prayer.'

---

Then we should find it easier to maintain our belief in immortality if we prayed for the dead. 'It would give us a practical relation with the other side, and to other immortality than our own. As

it is, we have little direct and practical contact with immortality so far as the day's life goes. No act of that life brings us into direct and practical connexion with the world of the dead. It is a dream; it is a world not realized. It does not belong to the strong and active side of our life. There is always about a life that works outward on another a certain note of distinction which is not made up for by any enthusiasm of Humanity. I knew an agnostic of a very fine kind who shortened his life by his devoted service to the very poor in a low part of London. There was to me a certain halo about him. And yet it is a different kind of spell that invests a life lived in the power of an endless life, a life that dwells with immortality daily.'

---

There is a third reason. Dr. FORSYTH believes that we have been commanded to pray for the dead. For 'we are bidden to pray for everything that is not trivial, "*in everything* making your requests known," and to cast every real care on God. There is nothing serious that we may not bring to the Father. A widow praying who does not know where her next shilling is to come from means more to the Father than a full choral service, and more engages His heart. And it is serious enough that half our heart, and all its treasure, should be snatched into the unseen. With that unseen our only sure link is the God to whom we pray. But He is as much the God of our dead as of us; and He is a God from whom they cannot be severed as they are from us. May our prayer to our common Father not put into petition what is always in our thoughts, and put into words what is always in our heart? If we name them before God, what are we doing in our way but what He does in His, and calling things that are not as though they were.'

---

It is often said that the Lord's Prayer, like the Ten Commandments, is divided into two parts. One part applies to God, and one part applies to man. Professor John OMAN, of Westminster



College, Cambridge, holds that that is a complete and disastrous misunderstanding. Professor OMAN's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer will be found in a volume entitled *Grace and Personality*, recently published in Cambridge at the University Press (6s. net).

---

It is impossible, he says, that the Prayer can be divided into two parts, a part for God and a part for man. For there is nothing in the world which applies to God and is not of practical moment for man. And there is nothing which applies to man and is not of immediate interest to God. 'Our relation to God is personal after such a fashion that our religion is necessarily an ethic and our ethic necessarily a religion.'

---

The Lord's Prayer begins with 'Our Father.' But 'Our Father' is not merely its introduction. It is not merely the address to God with which every prayer is understood to open. 'Our Father' is the ruling thought of the Prayer. It begins at the beginning and goes to the end. 'Deliverance from the Evil One, with which the prayer ends, is as much concerned with that name of Father as the hallowing of it, with which it begins, and each new petition follows from what goes before, expanding still farther the content of calling God our Father in Heaven.'

---

It is not as an interpretation of the Lord's Prayer alone that Professor OMAN makes 'Our Father' run throughout it. It is as an interpretation of all life. The Lord's Prayer is only an illustration. In all life the beginning is right reverence, and right reverence goes to the end. Reverence, or the recognition of God, expresses itself as loyalty. As St. Paul says, faith works through love. But the kingdom does not come by the loyalty, it comes by the reverence. 'The supreme hindrance to the coming of God's Kingdom is idolatry, not evil-doing.'

---

How often, says Professor OMAN, 'is that order reversed! Let us do Thy will, that Thy Kingdom

may be gradually brought in, and, in the end, every heart be inspired by the true reverence! The result is striving and crying, with the perpetual menace of defeat and the increasing shadow of despair. But the servant of the Lord should not strive, nor be, after that fashion, morally strenuous. An essentially apocalyptic hope, a dependence, not on man who runs, but on God who gives the victory, dominates this prayer as it does all our Lord's teaching; and the ground of it lies in beginning with the manifestation of God, and, only through it, reaching the activity of man, the order being first reverence, then surrender, then obedience.'

---

This is the comfort with which we ourselves are comforted when our sons have fallen in the war. This is the comfort which we can carry to others. Every man is judged according to the deeds which he has done in his body. That, says Professor CLOW, is one of the fundamental facts. And that is the idea of judgment which most of us have and will always have. But the deeds done in the body are only the outcome of the recognition of God. First 'Our Father,' then the loyalty to that discovery, and whatever deeds we have time for. If we have time for only one deed, the supreme act of self-sacrifice on the battlefield, that is enough. It does not save us. It does not atone for an evil life. But it expresses in the only way left to us now the fact that does save, the recognition of God in the heart, the reverence which finds its sufficient expression in the familiar words, 'Our Father which art in heaven.'

---

Now the recognition of God may be born in a man's soul in a moment, and the words, 'Our Father which art in heaven,' may at the same moment leap to his lips. Are we afraid to credit the men who are dying for us with a religion which they never professed? Real religion is not a process, it is an act. As Dr. FORSYTH says characteristically, 'It is not evolution, it is always revolution.' A crisis, a moment's deep emotion, the imminence of a unique experience—that will



do it. And that moment was theirs who faced the fact of death in the grey of the misty morning across the scarred fields of Flanders.

The last act of sacrifice does not wipe out the past. God wipes it out. And since it is God that wipes it out, the evil of it is not insurmountable. Therefore it is that to the mother of the wildest lad that ever lived we can come with assured confidence. It is assured confidence in God. We can even feel that in this there is a welcome compensation for the horrors of the war, that it has given to this one and to that the opportunity of uttering the word 'Father' in sincerity. That word uttered, the rest is with God.

When will the war be over? Does nobody know? Yes, one man knows.

Mr. E. A. BURROUGHS is Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford, and Canon of Peterborough. He is also Chaplain to His Majesty the King. Mr. BURROUGHS is not likely to assume the office of prophet without being called to it. Yet Mr. BURROUGHS knows, and says emphatically that he knows, exactly when the war will be over.

Mr. BURROUGHS has published a pamphlet on *The Delayed Decision* (Longmans; 3d. net). The title tells us at once that the war should have been over before this time. Why is it not over?

'There is a two-fold conviction which grows upon me, as (I doubt not) on others also, as the months drag on. One side of it is that the war was never meant by God to last so long. If we and our Allies had faced from the start the logic of it, and set ourselves to be morally and spiritually worthy of the cause He gave us to defend, we should, I believe, long since have reached a happy and righteous peace. Lord Kitchener's forecast of three years—"a year of preparation, a year of struggle, and a year of victory"—was not lightly made. When the third year began, the conviction

of all our troops in France, at any rate, was clear that it was "the year of victory."

Why did it not become the year of victory? Because we said, 'Gold and khaki will do it.' That was our British creed. We expressed it on the poster of a very popular journal in January 1917. And gold and khaki did not do it. A few months later gold and khaki found themselves effectually neutralized by that sudden outbreak in Russia of 'the unruly wills and affections of men.'

We need not blame the gold or the khaki. They both did all that it was possible for them to do. But they were not enough. We left out of account the things that are moral and spiritual. And without these things the war will never be won by us.

Wherever we look to-day, says Mr. BURROUGHS, whether in Russia, in France, in Italy, or in Britain, 'all that is thwarting us has but one root—lack of principle *somewhere*, lack of conscience *somewhere*. That is the real enemy behind Boloism, and profiteering, and strikes, and food-hogging, and uneven distribution, and most of the other difficulties which not only in themselves are a handicap to us, but also are the prolific sources of pessimism, disaffection, and labour unrest. If there were more conscience in every part of the community, there would be less incompetence, less unfairness, and less discontent. Our traditional British way of "muddling through" is not merely due to lack of parts: it is much more due to lack of application and thorough, thought-out work—that is, lack of conscience. It is lack of conscience that impairs efficiency, reduces output, saps enthusiasm, and so prolongs the war. And conscience is only another name for the sense and the fear of God.'

A secular writer has said that religion is the true cement of society. Had we and our Allies recognized it as such, Mr. BURROUGHS believes that 'the merely material gains resulting—to say



nothing of what help God Himself might have added thereto—would have been enough to win us the war long since. It would have “paid” materially to have reformed spiritually. And, what is more important, it would have left us ready to make the best use of peace, instead of having to think, as we now do, of the After-War period with sinking hearts. As it is, we have left religion—the greatest uniting, inspiring, and constructive force in the world—almost outside our calculations. If the coming of the war was the nemesis on materialism, its continuance is the penalty of opportunism—of halting between two opinions, paltering with God.’

And so the war will end when we truly take in God. The Pope has said so. Mr. BURROUGHS says so. Mr. BURROUGHS is surprised to find himself in agreement with the Pope—‘especially when the war is in question.’ But he is cordially at one with the Pope in what he said last Christmas. ‘The present calamity,’ he said, ‘will never finish till men return to God with the warmest prayer from the heart. As the unbridled lust of the senses plunged once celebrated cities into a sea of fire, so in our days public impiety and atheism, erected into a system of so-called civilization, has plunged the world into a sea of blood.’

But what exactly do the Pope and Mr. BURROUGHS mean by returning to God? Mr. BURROUGHS at any rate knows what he means. He means surrendering the lusts of the flesh. He says emphatically that the war will go on until we do surrender them. Now we are showing no sign at present of surrendering the lusts of the flesh. ‘Some of the most dangerous of those lusts have in this time of war, by common testimony, gained a hold among us such as they probably never had before. The things one hears on this subject from all quarters, at home and in the field, are utterly sickening; and there seems to be no real revolt of the national moral sense against it.’

But not only does Mr. BURROUGHS see that the destruction of those lusts will end the war; he also sees how they can be destroyed.

First of all, by means of ‘a fighting faith.’ ‘Our one supreme duty, whether as Christians or patriots, is to cry aloud and spare not, to leave no stone unturned, until our Government and people face the Fact which alone can save us. We must pray, and press, and organize, and if need be fight, to secure some honest, national recognition of God before it is too late. Other “interests” can impose their will on the Government—the brewers, for instance. Why cannot the Christians? The concessions extorted by the brewers are dead inconsistent with all that our rulers tell us is needed to win the war; yet, at the cost of eating their own words, our rulers go on making them. Why? Because the brewers appear to have an organized body of opinion—or, shall we say, of appetite?—behind them. The concessions which we Christians need to press for would be all in line with the appeals for sacrifice, economy, courage, and so forth, which are constantly being made to the nation: they would give them the background, the reality, which at present they lack. Are there really not enough convinced and united Christians in the country to compel the Government to see that we *can’t* be ignored—that God, whom we plead for, is also a Great Power who must be considered first of all? If we believe that nothing else can save the situation, we have got to do this, cost what it may.’

Next, by mutual encouragement. ‘We may encourage ourselves in the thought that there are thousands of patriots, not labelled Christians, not organized in Churches, who would welcome and back a brave and solid move along such lines: men and women who, three years ago, would have been indifferent, but now have suffered, and have learned their need of God, though they await a strong lead to rise and follow Him. Their faith is a national asset of supreme importance which can only be realized through our faith coming out



into the open—if need be, going “over the top”—in the effort to make our Government, who are our representatives, give effect to our will that they should recognize God.’

Thirdly, by throwing the same responsibility on the irreligious. For ‘we may well believe that even among the frankly irreligious a move in this direction would be welcomed, and would tend to restore public confidence, which is far more necessary than so-called optimism for winning the war. Even a man who has no religion himself knows what it is—in business, for instance—to trust before all others one who is known to be a man of God. There are some of our leaders whom we all want to *know* we can trust implicitly. Nothing could give us confidence in them—in their judgment as well as their devotion to principle—so much as some public avowal, in word and act, that they are placing their trust in God. Abraham Lincoln, bearing a burden infinitely less than rests upon our War Cabinet, tells us, “I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go; my own wisdom and that of all around me seemed insufficient for the day.” It is not only religious circles that would be reassured by the knowledge that our leaders also sought their leading upon their knees. A man who is really relying upon God has the secret of three things indispensable in a trusted leader: a quiet mind, inspiration, and freedom from any taint of self-seeking. And ultimately it is only a Christian politician whom any Christian either can or ought to follow blindly, as we are bidden follow to-day. That is why President Wilson means so much to the Allied cause.’

And last of all, by the continual remembrance that it is faith in God that secures the future. ‘Whatever may happen with regard to the end of the war, the hope of a new and better world after it rests with the men and the women in all nations who believe in God and will act accordingly. “True religion,” says “A Student in Arms,” “is

betting your life that there’s a God.” And that is the very heart of Christianity. That is the secret of the abolition of self, which is the fruit of the Spirit of Christ in a life. It is only a great wave of selflessness, passing through the whole community, that can make after-war reconstruction possible; and I challenge any man to show me whence we can get it except from Christ Himself. Patriotism produced such a wave in the early days of the war. But even that did not spread wide or deep enough; and now its force is largely spent. Patriotism as such, where it has ebbed, cannot now be recalled on an adequate scale. We need the higher and deeper devotion that comes with the spirit of Christ, to neutralize “self” in all its forms.’

‘We stand,’ says Mr. BURROUGHS, ‘face to face with a situation not unlike that in which London found itself in the year 1666, when, after the Great Fire, it became necessary to plan a new London for the future. It is on record that Sir Christopher Wren presented to the then authorities a comprehensive scheme of reconstruction, to centre in the new St. Paul’s Cathedral, from which broad, convenient thoroughfares would radiate in all directions. The plans were accepted; but it proved impossible to carry them out, to the great loss of London to this day. Why? Because the individual citizens of those days insisted on having their own little houses on their own little plots built up exactly as they had been before. Self arose and spoiled the future: and so the old London, with its crookedness and its narrowness, is with us still. And for us to-day the question is, Shall the new world after the war perpetuate the crookednesses and narrownesses of the pre-war world? or shall it be a world intersected with broad ways of righteousness and truth, converging upon, and radiating from, their one true source and centre—the living worship of the living God? It is only the Christians of the world who can secure that this ideal is realized — by *being* Christians, that is, reformers and fighters by God’s side, and never resting till the Christian law and spirit prevail.’



## Some Principles of Missionary Work.

A STUDY OF 1 PETER ii. 11-17.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM A. SHEDD, M.A., URUMIA, PERSIA.

THE attitude of the New Testament to the whole question of missionary methods and means is that which obtains in the whole sphere of practical life. There is no attempt to furnish a manual of methods. There are both principles and history. Exhortations are few, perhaps because they were not needed. Even definite statements of the missionary obligation are not numerous. Far more emphasis is placed on the end than the means. Nowhere is the evangelistic purpose of the Christian life more clearly emphasized than in the First Epistle of St. Peter. In all the passages that might be quoted, the order of thought is the same: exhortation to pure and holy living 'that ye may shew forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light'; or that wives may gain their unbelieving husbands; or in the passage we are studying, 'that by well-doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men'; and 'that they (the Gentiles) may by your good works, which they behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.' A passage so dominated by the missionary aim may be expected to yield missionary principles, and we shall find that this is the case, finding furthermore that the principles contained in it are remarkably comprehensive and complementary.

There is in the first place what may be called the principle of *separateness*. 'I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims' (or in R.V., 'as sojourners and pilgrims'). Thayer defines the Greek words used, 'one who lives in a country without the right of citizenship,' and 'one who comes from a foreign country into a city or land to reside there by the side of the natives.' 'I beseech you as aliens and foreign residents' are words that are startlingly appropriate in reference to the foreign mission enterprise. The thought underlying is that expressed by Paul in the words, 'Our citizenship is in heaven.' Harnack expresses it, 'Not like the Gentiles, nor like the Jews, but as the people of God—that is the watchword.' In his wonderful way Paul glorifies the thought when he says, 'We are ambassadors on behalf of Christ,' referring not

to the exemptions and privileges of the office, but to its responsibilities. The temptation that arises from the sense of freedom is the basis of the warning in our passage, 'as free, and not using your freedom as a cloak.'

The truest application of the principle is not that which lies upon the surface. It is to be found in the very nature of the foreign mission enterprise, rather than in its accidents. The work of the missionary is temporary. He hopes to be superseded, and the highest success imaginable is to become unnecessary. All that he does is with a view to revision and change. He organizes a church, hoping that it may be merged in some new and great movement of God's Spirit, and any lordship on his part is usurpation. All he holds he holds in trust for those for whom he works. So again the missionary does not seek to represent another civilization different from that of the country he lives in as a sojourner. His services to civilization may be great, but they are not primary. Both the forms of church order and the institutions of civilization are at best only blundering attempts to express the evangel he seeks to make known.

Shall we call the complementary principle that of *assimilation*? It is hinted at in the words, 'using not your freedom as a cloak,' and is more clearly expressed in the phrase 'having your behaviour seemly among the Gentiles.' 'Seemly,' or 'beautiful,' implies not merely intrinsic beauty, but such an adaptation to the accepted canons or ideals of beauty as to be recognized as beautiful. Another and more uncompromising expression is the command, 'Be subject to every ordinance of man,' or in the language of to-day, 'Be subject to every human institution.' Stronger still is the final expression, 'As bondservants of God,' 'As free . . . but as bondservants.' There is no timid trimming here in order to avoid apparent inconsistency.

The underlying principle is that expressed by Paul, 'All things to all men, that I may by all means save some.' The following is an expression



of the problem and principle found in a prominent missionary magazine: 'For a Christian to influence a Hindu it is necessary that he should enter into his feelings and understand, if not share, his aspirations. Now this is the very point where we become conscious of difficulty: we may long for a mutual trust and sympathy; but how painfully conscious do we soon become that our feelings and ideals are not theirs. Many of us in India, lay and clerical, missionary and non-missionary, have felt that it would be useless to try to so modify our lives according to Hindu prejudices and convictions as to commend them to Hindus; and have judged that it is best to be what we are, Englishmen, and to try to live the Life as we ourselves have apprehended it.'<sup>1</sup> Probably the last sentence of the quotation expresses the conclusion reached by most, even of those who are earnest and devoted. It would be folly to argue that the success of missions depends entirely on the adaptation of missionaries to native ideas and customs; but to deny this element to be a very large factor in the problem would be to run counter to the more thoughtful literature of missions. Any one who has had personal experience of the difficulties of the problem may well judge with some lenience the vacillation of Peter at Antioch which aroused the indignation of Paul. The problem at Antioch was complicated by other elements, and yet what Peter did was to follow the evangelistic impulse and fellowship with heathen and then to draw back under the pressure of religious and race prejudice. In one guise or another the problem presents itself in every age and land. In no age has it been more urgent than now, when the ancient East is rousing to new aspirations and hopes, which need and long for sympathetic and intelligent interpretation and guidance.

A third principle is *the evangelistic power of right living*. Good works are means that shall lead men to glorify God, and well-doing is the power able to silence the ignorance of foolish men. (What a true phrase that is, the ignorance of foolish men!) Elsewhere the apostle urges his readers to keep a good conscience, that cavilling critics may be put to shame. The meaning hardly needs explanation, but the practical applications are numerous. Scripture, reason, and comparative

religion may all be invoked with good reason to justify the cause of missions; but practically missions are justified in the eyes of men by their good works. There is no missionary apologetic like the practical beneficence resulting from the work.

The principle that good deeds have a direct evangelistic power justifies the expansion of the scope of missionary work to include humanitarian enterprises. Jowett in commenting on the passage remarks, 'The Christian will not stand aloof from his fellows. . . . He will fit himself into the social order, into the body corporate, and he will willingly share his blood in the common life. If this be the evangelistic character, the character that tells upon the "Gentiles," then Christian life is not perfected and beautified when the hallowing of the social order is ignored.'<sup>2</sup> 'To fit itself into the social order' of the community and to become part of the corporate life, is precisely what is done by every well-established mission. Not simply in the lives of the individual missionaries, but as a corporate body, the mission is far more than a 'voice crying in the wilderness.' In its manliness and human interests it is a 'great rock in a weary land.' It represents integrity, honesty, faithfulness, and helpfulness. The multiplicity of operations in missionary work is sometimes the despair of the missionary himself, and it is assuredly not without peril; but it is no modern invention. One of the most important missionary books for many a year is Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*, and one of the lessons to be learned from it is the complex character of the process by which the Roman world was evangelized. He gives a list of ten different forms taken by the charitable work of the early Church, and says of the healing mission of the Church, 'In its early days the Church, we may say, formed a permanent establishment for the relief of sickness and poverty.'<sup>3</sup> It would be difficult to point out an agency of modern missions that did not have its prototype in the first three Christian centuries.

The principle we are considering emphasizes what may be called the ethical mission of the work of missions. If Christian doctrine is the product of long process not yet complete, morality is so in a far greater degree. The moral problems

<sup>1</sup> Rev. A. A. Blair, *The East and the West*, July 1908, p. 248.

<sup>2</sup> Practical Commentary on N.T., *Epp. of St. Peter*.

<sup>3</sup> *Expansion of Christianity*, Eng. tr., i. 190, 148.



that meet the missionary, both as respects his own conduct and as respects the people he works among, are often novel and intricate. The newly formed church, must form its code of morals adapted to its peculiar circumstances, and the community must be aroused to the evil of practices which have been long accepted and, it may be, hallowed by religious sanctions. The missionary's own moral conduct must not only be controlled by the highest principles, but must also be so conformed to the ideals of the people as to be recognized as true to the highest morality. In other words, the culture of conscience becomes a part of the missionary vocation.

Here again there is a complementary principle, which is intensive and restrictive in its operation. It is the *evangelistic purpose*, that must give point and direction to the moral life and beneficent activity. 'That they may glorify God,' 'that ye should put to silence.' It is this aim, the aim to save souls, that alone can organize and unify and vivify a complex and manifold work; it alone can make the text-book, the surgeon's knife, the social call, the casual meeting, the distribution of alms, sympathy for the oppressed and with new aspirations for freedom and progress and the ordinances of Christian worship, it alone can make each and all means to lead men to Christ. It alone can open the dumb lips, awaken the dormant sympathies, keep clear the eye of conscience, give nerve to the lagging spirit, arouse to prayer, and feed the living flame of spiritual life. It was this that sent forth both Master and

disciple, 'As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world.'

Two remarks may perhaps with force be made, as to the results of the study of this passage. One is that light may be found in the New Testament upon the problems of present-day missionary work. Two such problems have emerged in this study, both of which might very copiously be illustrated from the literature of missions. One is the relation of the missionary to the institutions and customs of the land in which he lives. The other is the proper scope of foreign missionary activity. The principles found in the passage before us are directly applicable to both of these problems. It is believed that the study of the principles underlying the New Testament conception of the work of evangelization will not only give inspiration and direction to the work, but will also confirm faith in the form which the enterprise has taken in modern times. The other remark is that the problems of missionary work as we have seen them are at bottom questions of Christian character and life. Given the gospel to be preached, the great question is to secure that the work done, and the workers doing it, shall be faithful in commending, both in manner and in matter of work, the gospel which is preached. In other words, in the foreign field as well as in Christian lands, the lasting success of Christianity depends upon the elevation of the moral ideals which it presents, and upon the degree of spiritual power it furnishes, to realize those ideals.

## Literature.

### GEORGE SYLVESTER MORRIS.

GEORGE SYLVESTER MORRIS was Head of the Department of Philosophy in the University of Michigan from 1887 to 1889. In the latter year he died. It is a quarter of a century ago. And now Professor R. M. Wenley, who occupies the position once occupied by Professor Morris, has written his biography—*The Life and Work of George Sylvester Morris* (Macmillan).

Morris came of the two strains which have done so much for America—the Puritan and the Pilgrim

—the stern Puritan being represented in his father, the gracious Pilgrim in his mother. And he was brought up in accordance with the theology of New England Puritanism, the presence of the Pilgrim idealism being latent until well into manhood. The great matters of social conduct were Slavery and Intemperance. His father was an uncompromising enemy to both—and suffered for it. The atmosphere (softened by the presence of sisters and the love of music) was one to foster manhood.

After college, Morris took charge of a school for



a short time. On resigning, to study theology, he made this entry in his diary—he was then twenty-one years of age:

‘I am about to leave Royalton. I have been Preceptor in Royalton Academy one year.

‘I have failed during my stay here in the following respects. (1) In labours for the spiritual welfare of my pupils. I might have been a better Christian, thus setting a better example, if I had been actuated in my Christian exercises and acts less by fear and more by love to Christ. I might actually have led some of my scholars to Christ, if I had laboured expressly for this purpose, subject, of course, to the decisions of an all-wise Providence. (2) In my intercourse with my scholars I have not, in many cases, exhibited that force of character which I should have desired; nor have I led their minds to the proper objects of thought and desire, to the same extent to which I should like to have done it. (3) I have not taught as energetically, faithfully and conscientiously as it would have been well to do.

‘On the other hand, I have endeavoured (1) weakly to lead my pupils to a correct and thorough knowledge of all their branches of study. I have the satisfaction of knowing that I have been partly successful. (2) I have tried, by precept both orally and by lectures, to set before them right motives for study, and right objects of ambition, and to incite them to enthusiasm and studiousness in many subjects more or less connected with their studies. (3) I have sought, more or less to be genial and pleasant in my intercourse with my scholars, to assure them of my personal interest in them, and, by my conduct, to secure their respect. (4) In the conduct of the daily religious exercises, I have to some extent sought to render it impressive, and trust that some impressions have been communicated thus, which will be permanent and useful.

‘I have been treated cordially and with great respect by scholars and citizens. I leave because I cannot, consistently with my plans and desires, remain. I have no time to throw away.’

He travelled in Europe. In Germany he met many of the great men. The inevitable took place. He determined not to study for the Church. He translated Ueberweg’s *History of Philosophy*. In 1870 he was appointed Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in Michigan, in 1881 Professor of Ethics, and in 1887 Professor of Philosophy and Head of that Department.

He was great as a teacher. This is what Professor Dewey says: ‘There are teachers who inspire, but their inspiration, tested by time, appears mainly emotional, and hence temporary, transient. There are scholars who are thorough and honest, but whose attitude toward their subject seems, if not perfunctory and formal, at least professional, a tradesmanlike affair. Mr. Morris was of that rarer group where scholarship blends with enthusiasm; where competent technical methods lend themselves to the support of inspiration. I cannot imagine either the student indifferent to philosophy or the student whose main concern with it was professional leaving Professor Morris’s classes without having gained a respect for the disinterested play of mind,—for scholarship not as a badge of possession or external accomplishment, but as a vital concern.’

Professor Wenley is a biographer.

#### ORGANIC EVOLUTION.

Even those whose business lies in the great depths of Theology and Philosophy have to know a little science. There is one science in particular that they must know. It is the science of Organic Evolution. For it will never do to be content with the reading of essays on the relation between Evolution and Religion or a popular book on the Descent of Man. No one can accomplish his work without a sufficient grasp of the principles of Evolution to give him confidence. No one can relieve others of the perplexities arising between Evolution and Creation without being sure that he has solved them for himself.

Now there are many books on Organic Evolution, but we must seek the best. And the latest is likely to be the best. For there is progress in this science. The latest is a text-book which has been written by Richard Swann Lull, Ph.D., Professor of Vertebrate Paleontology in Yale University. Its title is simply *Organic Evolution* (Macmillan). It is a volume of more than seven hundred pages, for every aspect of the subject is dealt with, however tersely, and there is a very great number of illustrations, some of them in the text and some on separate plates.

The merit of the book for the unscientific is that its every word is intelligible. You may come to it as to your first scientific instructor in science and you will be able to carry it all with you. The



diagrams and photographs are not required for comprehension, though they are effective as illustrations and aids to memory.

Here is a short section which will bear out all that has been said. And as it has no figures accompanying it, there is no loss in quotation. Its theme is the significance of adaptation in animals that have to preserve their lives by running.

'Not only does speed adaptation give rise to some of nature's most beautiful and perfect machines, but it seems to have a much deeper meaning which has been summarized by Broom. He is speaking of Permian reptiles:

"The African, or more preferably the South Atlantic type, is chiefly remarkable for the great development of the limbs . . . What may have been the cause we can not at present tell, but it was a most fortunate thing for the world. It was the lengthened limb that gave the start to the mammals. When the Therapsidan [mammal-like reptile] took to walking with its feet underneath and the body off the ground it first became possible for it to become a warm-blooded animal. All the characters that distinguish a mammal from a reptile are the result of increased activity—the soft flexible skin with hair, the more freely movable jaws, the perfect four-chambered heart, and the warm blood. It is further singularly interesting to note that the only other warm-blooded animals, the birds, arose in a similar fashion from a different reptilian group. A primitive sort of dinosaur took to walking on its hind-legs, and the greatly increased activity possible resulted in the development of birds. Birds were reptiles that became active on their hind-legs, mammals are reptiles that acquired activity through the development of all four."

'Back of all this lay the impelling natural cause. The earliest known mammals are late Triassic, the first recorded bird Middle Jurassic; the inference that both stocks arose in Permian time is justifiable from the degree of evolution which each class had attained by the time the actual record of their existence begins. Schuchert tells us that early in the Permian the climate of the lands seems everywhere to have been arid or semiarid and that this condition lasted into Jurassic time. One characteristic of desert animals of to-day—the lizards, birds, gazelle, Persian ass—is *speed*, for the creature must fare widely for food and drink if he would fare well.

Again Schuchert tells us that the Permian was a time of extensive glaciation with a severity of climate, especially in the southern land masses, as great as if not greater than the polar one of Quaternary time, although, like the latter, the Permian glacial period had warmer interglacial intervals as well. The incentive for speed already given, rendering the development of warm blood possible, the devastating cold would soon place a premium upon such as did develop it and eliminate those which did not. From this fortunate relation of cause and effect arose on the one hand the primal mammal, making human evolution possible, and on the other hand the ancestral bird.'

### SOCIAL LIFE.

Mr. G. G. Coulton, M.A., St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, is the compiler of a volume of quotations serving to illustrate *Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 15s. net). The quotations have been searched out and found in some cases in the most inaccessible places—places that are quite inaccessible to ordinary readers of books. 'A large proportion are translated (and many for the first time) from Latin or Old French. The rest are presented unmodernized (though sometimes, as the reader is warned, with some abridgment) in their medieval garb. To this end the compiler has made specially free use of such old translations as those of Trevisa, Lord Berners, and the *Alphabet of Tales*. Even where the episode was given more fully by a first-rate chronicler like Matthew Paris, it seemed preferable to reproduce it in Trevisa's naïve rendering of Higden's compilation; since here we have the actual English that Chaucer heard.'

It is a most entertaining book. One can pick it up and lay it down at will, but never can one light upon an uninteresting or even an unedifying page. Yet the best way is to read it from the beginning to the end. For only in that way can the growth of knowledge and the progress of culture in this country throughout the Middle Ages be appreciated. Mr. Coulton has never shirked the necessity of suppression. If there is overlapping there is good reason for it. And he has been so merciful to the general reader as to



interpret steadily either in introductions or in footnotes.

Out of so many titbits that arrest how shall a selection be made? The first is by Policraticus. It is taken and translated from Migne's *Patrologia Latina* (vol. 199, col. 600):

THE FUNCTION OF KNIGHTHOOD.—'But what is the function of orderly knighthood? To protect the church, to fight against treachery, to reverence the priesthood, to fend off injustice from the poor, to make peace in your own province, to shed your blood for your brethren, and, if needs must, to lay down your life.'

The next is from the Coventry *Leet Book* (A.D. 1484):

A STRIKE AMONG THE BAKERS.—'Mem. that in the moneth of Decembre the yere aforesaid the Bakers of the sede Citie in gret nombre riottesly disposed assembled theym and unlawfully confedered, intendyng of hight wille the reproche of the seid Maire, sodenly departed oute of the seid Cite unto Bakinton, levyng the seid Cite destitute of 'bred'; wherthorough not only straungers resortyng to the seid Cite and the Inhabitauntes of the same were unvittailed, in gretly noysyng the seid Cite and villany and reproche of the seid Maire and all the officers therof. Of which riotte divers of the seid Bakers were indited, as appereth of recorde in the seid Cite etc. Whech seid Bakers callyng theym to theymself, resorted and came unto the seid Maire and humbly submytted theymself unto his correccion. Wheruppon they were commytte[d] to warde, and their ffyn [as]sessed bi the seid Maire and other Justices of pease within the seid Cite at xxli.; of which somme xli. was offen to theym ageny etc., the other xli. was resceyved . . . [and to give surety to obey the Mayor's orders and keep the assize for the future, or pay 20s. fine].'

### A CHINESE PHILOSOPHER.

'In the year 1911, I was asked to make a special study of the philosophy of Wang Yang-ming (A.D. 1472-1529) for the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society of Shanghai. As a result, I undertook a thorough investigation of his standpoint; and in the autumn of 1912 read a paper before the Society on "A Study in the Life and Philosophy of Wang Yang-ming."

'Having become greatly interested in his approach

to the problems of philosophy, and knowing that his thought is exercising a profound influence upon the Chinese and the Japanese, I decided to translate his *Biography, Instructions for Practical Life, Record of Discourses, and Letters* into English. The present volume is the outcome, which I now offer to students everywhere, with the hope that it may inspire a desire for a fuller knowledge of the splendid achievements of the Chinese, and a deeper appreciation of their worth.'

Thus Dr. Frederick Goodrich Henke of Chicago explains the origin of his book *The Philosophy of Wang Yang-ming* (Open Court Pub. Co.; \$2.50 net). What was Wang Yang-ming's doctrine? Dr. Henke may be quoted again: 'Wang Yang-ming, who lived three and one half centuries after Chu, was an idealist of the monistic type. For him mind covered the entire gamut of existence; he thought that nothing exists independent of and apart from mind. His point of view was consequently at variance with Chu's. He had considerable difficulty in defending his break with the traditional interpretation of the classics, but he succeeded remarkably well.

'As a rationalizing and socializing factor in the development of life, his exposition exhibits the following doctrines:

'1. Every individual may understand the fundamental principles of life and of things, including moral laws, by learning to understand his own mind, and by developing his own nature. This means that it is not necessary to use the criteria of the past as present-day standards. Each individual has the solution of the problems of the universe within himself. "Man is the measure of all things."

'2. On the practical side, every one is under obligation to keep knowledge and action, theory and practice together, for the former is so intimately related to the latter that its very existence is involved. There can be no real knowledge without action. The individual has within himself the spring of knowledge and should constantly carry into practice the things that his intuitive knowledge of good gives him opportunity to do.

'3. Heaven, earth, man, all things are an all-pervading unity. The universe is the macrocosm, and each human mind is a microcosm. This naturally leads to the conceptions, equality of opportunity and liberty, and as such serves well as the fundamental principle of social activity and reform.'



The most impressive thing in the book is the insistence with which the philosopher exalts the intuitive faculty. In one of the Letters, he says: 'The scholar who keeps to the path of duty really has the clear apprehension and realization which come from the intuitive faculty, and is completely in harmony with himself and perfectly intelligent. Magnanimous and spacious, he is one with heaven and earth. What thing is not included in the great vastness of heaven and earth, which, nevertheless, not a single thing can cover or obscure? Now, the intuitive faculty is by nature characterized by quick apprehension, clear discernment, far-reaching intelligence, and all-embracing knowledge. It is magnanimous, generous, benign, and mild; it is impulsive, energetic, firm, and enduring; it is self-adjusted, grave, correct, and true to the mean; it is accomplished, distinctive, concentrative, and searching. All-embracing it is and vast; deep and active as a fountain, sending forth its virtues in due season. The intuitive faculty does not naturally long for wealth and honor, nor is it solicitous because of poverty and humble position. In its natural condition it is not delighted because of attainment, nor distressed because of loss, nor are certain things chosen because of fondness for them and others put aside because they are disliked. Thus the ears could not be used to listen to anything were it not for the intuitive faculty. How could it be apprehended? (75) The eyes could not be used to look at anything were it not for the intuitive faculty. How could it be clearly discerned? The mind could not be used in deliberating on and realizing anything were it not for the intuitive faculty. How could there be any far-reaching intelligence and all-embracing knowledge? Moreover, how could there be any magnanimity, generosity, benignity, and mildness if there were no intuitive faculty? How could there be impulsiveness, energy, firmness, and endurance? How could there be self-control, gravity, maintenance of the mean, correctness, accomplishment, distinction, concentration, and investigation? How could one say of any individual, "All-embracing is he and vast, deep and active as a fountain, sending forth his virtues in their due season"?''

This is the clue to the interpretation of the whole book. At first it seems unattractive, its distance being so great. But that sense of distance is due more, far more, to the form than to the

matter of the philosophy. After a time the unfamiliarity lessens and the universally applicable truth of the doctrine becomes apparent. For the truth that only character counts, and that character is independent of external circumstances, is universal truth. With it the Chinese and all mankind are really educated, without it no passing examinations will matter, as Wang Yang-ming is constantly proclaiming.

Dr. Henke has done his work well. And he has proved that it was worth doing. The time will come when the knowledge of Chinese thought will enter the Western world. Hitherto it is Hinduism that has held the attention of the West. China may be less religious than India, but it is very much more ethical, and it is in the ethical application of religion that we are going to make most progress now.

### SPIRITUAL HEALING.

Canon H. L. Goudge is always up to date and always reverent. His new volume *Thoughts for Dark Days* (Skeffingtons; 3s. 6d. net) is an exposition of the Epistle of James. Every topic is touched. But every topic is so touched that it leaps into life. Even 'faith and works'—how silly to say that it is a dead controversy! Canon Goudge says that 'to every one of us it is a matter of life and death'; and you recognize as 'you read that what he says is true.

One of the ancient and modern issues which he handles is spiritual healing. He handles it as courageously as the rest. 'The question is up to a certain point entirely simple. God can heal the body as easily as the soul; and bodily health, if it is desired for the fulfilment of God's purpose, is an absolutely right subject for prayer. St. James says exactly what we should expect him to say. Illness is something abnormal in the Christian Church; its presence, St. James evidently thinks, suggests sin behind. What then is to be done? Let the sick man "call for the elders of the Church." The Church is a brotherhood; the blessing needed by one is a blessing for all, and the Church should seek it through its appointed leaders. They should come; they should use the appropriate sacramental means; they should pray over the sick man, and invoke the name of the Great Healer. The prayer of faith will then save him that is sick, and the Lord will raise him up. "If



he have committed sins"—the next verse presupposes that they have been confessed—"it shall be forgiven him." If the sickness is a punishment, the sin must be abandoned, if the punishment is to be removed. Now what could be simpler or more straightforward than all this? Of course, there may be exceptions. The sickness may be in some way for the glory of God. We read that St. Paul "besought the Lord thrice" for the removal of his thorn in the flesh, and had to learn that for God's good purposes it must remain. Having learned that, he would not have wished it to be removed. But, normally, the procedure of St. James is plainly the right method of Christian action; St. Paul himself did not cease to pray for his own deliverance till a fuller discernment of the mind of God was given to him. Ought we, then, to-day, to follow out St. James's teaching? Certainly, when the conditions are the same, and those who do as he bids us assure us of the blessing that follows. Only, let us be sure that the conditions are fulfilled. The Christian Churches of St. James's day had many faults, but they were assemblies of believers. Their members were men and women who had come out from the world to live for the divine kingdom. St. James says: "Is any among you sick?" and we must not forget the limitation which the word "you" involves. The subject of healing is a Christian man, who has confessed and renounced his sin, not one who desires health that he may spend it upon his pleasures. Were we to preach upon the housetops the power of holy unction, there would doubtless be many who would be ready to give it a trial, in just the same spirit as they try a new drug. But we could not expect healing to follow, and the failure would be injurious to faith. We must create the conditions first in faithful sick people and in faithful elders of the Church. Then—and not till then—may we ask and receive, that our joy may be full.

Would you know a nation? Know their folk-songs and their folktales. Dr. Josef Baudis, M.R.I.A., Lecturer in Comparative Philology at the Prague University, has selected and translated a volume of *Czech Folk Tales* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net) which will bring us very near to the hearts and the hearths of that much enduring people. They cry for the moon, as we all do.

And their cry is to be in some measure realized, we ourselves helping towards its realization. There is a truly charming Czech girl for frontispiece, and there are appropriate illustrations in front of some of the tales.

Paper shortage has greatly reduced the size of *The Baptist Handbook for 1918* (Baptist Union; 2s. 6d. net). But the editor, the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., has omitted wisely. All the personal element is retained, the Societies and their Secretaries, the complete list of Baptist Ministers and Probationers in the British Isles. When the war is over (and the Germans are doing their best at the present time to end it by throwing their forces into the furnace without mercy), then the Baptist Handbook will recover its original size and will even increase with the sure increase of the Church.

Mr. William Henry Hudson, Staff Lecturer in Literature to the Extension Board, University of London, has written *A Short History of English Literature in the Nineteenth Century* (Bell). The space is most economically allotted. Wordsworth receives ten pages, Coleridge seven, Tennyson eight, Browning seven. Bagehot, Leslie Stephen, and Lord Morley are all fitted into a page. No names are omitted. And the utmost care seems to be given to make accurate the numerous titles and dates. There is no attempt at smart characterization, but the economy of space has compelled many estimates that will be remembered for their epigrammatic terseness.

'The Commission on the War of the Church of Scotland appointed a Committee of its members to study the Moral and Social Issues involved in this great calamity. This Committee made a survey of the field assigned to them, and, on the invitation of the Committee, papers were contributed to elucidate the spheres of influence which the Church should endeavour to occupy.' These preliminary papers have now been gathered into a volume, with the title of *Social Evils and Problems* (Blackwood). The first half of the book is occupied with Social Evils. Crime is discussed by the Lord Justice-Clerk, Intemperance by Dr. R. Menzies Fergusson, Impurity by Professor W. A. Curtis, the Decreasing Birthrate by Dr. Norman Maclean, Gambling by Lord Sands, the Decline of



Discipline by Dr. W. S. Bruce; Avarice, Luxury, and Waste by Professor Cooper. And that is but the first half of the book. The other half is occupied with Social Problems—Disintegration, Child Welfare, Adolescence, Rural Depopulation, Destitution, Housing, Industry, Business, Politics, and International Relations.

The book is edited by Professor W. P. Paterson and Dr. David Watson. Professor Paterson contributes the Introduction—a masterly survey of the whole situation.

*The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church*, by Professor G. H. Gerberding, D.D., LL.D., is issued in a 'Reformation Jubilee Edition,' revised, improved, and enlarged, and with a Preface by the Rev. M. Rhodes, D.D., President of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States (Philadelphia: General Council Pub. House). It is a book which has long since passed beyond the need of appreciation, for thirty thousand copies of it have been sold. The author has a good knowledge of his subject and can write in a clear captivating style. The book is at once a theological manual and a preacher of the Gospel.

'Watchman' has told us in *The Tower* (Headley Bros.; 2s. net) how it will be with the world after the war—some time after. For one thing, we shall burn no more coals. The time has already come as he writes: 'Science has told us that coal is much too valuable to be burned as it used to be. Science has taught us to win from it carbonic and picric acids, paraffin and naphthaline, benzine, toluene and pitch, ammonium sulphate and phosphate for fertilisers, even soot for printing inks and polishes, as well as for manures. A whole host of lesser trades depend for their raw material on coal. The coal seams of the country have been surveyed and classified for this end, and the practical problems of carbonising and gasifying the raw materials for obtaining those by-products, and leaving the result available for heat and light and power have been tackled by the chemists and engineers.'

It is the prophecy of an industrial paradise. It may be as true as it is charmingly related.

Under the title of *Two Brave Brothers* (London: R. J. James) there has been published a biography of two of the sons of the First Baron Llangattock.

There were three sons. One died as the result of influenza, shockingly mismanaged by somebody. Of the two here commemorated the more famous was the younger, the Hon. Charles S. Rolls. He is known as the inventor and maker, along with Mr. F. H. Royce, of the famous Rolls-Royce car. He is not forgotten as an aviator; for did he not break records in those early days by crossing and recrossing the Channel? Then one morning a slight accident happened to his biplane and he was killed. Monmouth cannot make enough of his memory; and the Country joins with Monmouth in admiration for a true British hero.

The eldest son succeeded his father before the war began. In October 1916 he went to France as Major of the 1st Monmouthshire Artillery, 4th Welsh Brigade, and within three weeks he was shot. 'Accompanied by two or three of his men, he had gone forward a considerable distance from the Battery to a point of observation, where he received severe gunshot wounds in the jaw and hand. With his characteristic unselfishness he attempted to walk to the dressing-station, as he said that the stretchers were needed for others. Even at the time when he was thus grievously wounded, his first thought was for his men, who loved him. In spite of his great suffering, he implored the next in command, as he was put into the train for Boulogne, "*Take care of my men*"—the same words he had used when he was being borne away from the spot where he fell.'

The biography is full of photographs. To motorists and aviators it will be especially welcome.

The Sunday Afternoon Address is a thing by itself. And the man who can give it must have first received the gift. The Rev. G. Gilbert Muir is such a man. The twenty-five addresses which he publishes under the title of *The Throne without the Czar* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net) have all been delivered with applause. They are very moral, but they are never 'mere morality.' Of course he tells his anecdotes, and he tells them pithily. 'I remember hearing the story of a preacher riding in a trap behind a runaway horse. He turned to the driver and said, "I would give half-a-crown to be out of this trap." "Keep your half-crown," said the driver; "you'll be out for nothing in a moment!"'

A volume of Studies in the Lord's Prayer has been published by the Rev. H. T. Burgess, LL.D.,



under the title of *Our Father* (Kelly; 5s. net). It contains an exposition of each of the petitions of the Prayer. The exposition is not simply a sermon. It is more educative than sermons are expected to be and less hortatory. It is particularly adapted for the devotional use of the Prayer.

But besides the exposition of the petitions there is an Introduction, occupying more than a third part of the volume, and handling such topics as the Philosophy of Prayer, Prayer and Personality, Christ's Example in Prayer; and then two chapters, more directly bearing on the Lord's Prayer itself, entitled 'the Pattern Prayer' and 'the Password Prayer.' These chapters are full of useful instruction and will be read with genuine enjoyment.

Throughout the volume there are insets which deserve attention, one an analytical arrangement of the Lord's Prayer, one a Chant (by E. M. Cooper), and one a metrical Version. A Postscript gives a Paraphrase of the Prayer, said to have been found in the pocket-book of a soldier who had been slain on the battlefield.

Mr. G. P. Cuttriss, who belongs to the Third Australian Division (he nowhere mentions his rank), has written down his impressions of the Australian soldier, calling the book '*Over the Top*' (Kelly; 3s. net). The impressions are quite occasional and not at all philosophical, and the pencil sketches with which they are illustrated are like them. There are not a few ugly acts on the part of the Germans recorded, but for the sake of our common humanity we shall quote an incident of the other kind. 'We attempted to raid the enemy trenches. The weather was bitterly cold and the night was dark. Our artillery put over a heavy barrage, after which the raiding party went forth; they crept forward over the muddy ground, and entered the German lines. Several casualties were sustained during the operations. When our men returned to their trenches, it was discovered that one of the raiding party was missing. When the noise of the counter-barrage had died down, a cry for help was distinctly heard by our front line troops. It came from "no man's land." A couple of stretcher-bearers and two men went out in search of the one in distress. While groping about amongst the wire in the darkness, they heard the Germans assuring the man for whom they were searching

that he would be all right. Suddenly the enemy turned a trench searchlight on to "no man's land," and by this light the search party were guided to their wounded comrade. The light was kept on him until he was rescued, and was then used to guide the party back to their own lines. During this time no shot was fired.'

For all whom it may concern (and it concerns many persons and 'publicists' beyond the Congregational Churches), but especially for Congregationalists themselves, who ought to possess a copy and peruse it every year, we announce the issue for 1918 of *The Congregational Year Book* (Memorial Hall; 3s. 6d. net). It offers a fine portrait of Principal Griffith-Jones as frontispiece, Principal Griffith-Jones being Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales for 1918-19. It contains, further, a complete (and succinct) biography of every living Congregational pastor and preacher.

It seems that in the United States of America parents are accustomed to go to the Heads of schools and dictate what their children are to be taught and what not. Mr. Columbus N. Millard turns the tables on the parents. He tells them what *their* duty is, and calls his book very plainly, *A Parent's Job* (Boston: Pilgrim Press; \$1 net). Let parents accept the reproof and follow the advice. The reproof is given in all courtesy; the advice is experienced and excellent. There is even something like a revelation of duty in such a chapter as that on 'Home Education prior to entering School.' Home education prior to entering school includes exercise in the open air. Now 'the most attractive inducements to exercise in the open air are *things that go*. By far the best of these is the *Irish Mail*, because it exercises both arms and legs, and besides increasing lung capacity greatly strengthens the abdominal muscles. The author knows a boy whose digestion up to the age of four was so delicate that often for several successive days he could retain no food. The end of these attacks was correlative with the purchase of an *Irish Mail*, which the youth had to be taught to ride, but in which he became so interested that for more than a year he operated it most vigorously whenever weather conditions permitted.' But—'the chief point to be remembered in connection with the pre-school use of all the articles and



devices mentioned is that attention to them must not be forced but attracted.'

Dr. Frederick Carl Eiselen, Professor of Old Testament Interpretation in Garrett Biblical Institute, has undertaken to write a series of books introductory to the Old Testament. He has already published the volume on the Pentateuch. Now he has issued the volume on *The Psalms and other Sacred Writings* (New York: Methodist Book Concern; \$1.75 net). It is probable that the series will consist of four volumes, for this volume covers all the Old Testament books except the Historical and the Prophetical. It even includes Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, no doubt on the understanding that these books are not primarily history, and Daniel not primarily prophecy.

Professor Eiselen is a higher critic with Conservative instincts. He has studied the Old Testament for himself, and has independently come to conclusions that differ very little from those of Driver's *Introduction* or Hastings' *Dictionary*. And he has the skill to make all he believes credible. He has no combative proclivities. Addressing himself to the ordinary reader of the Bible, he states clearly the results at which the most competent scholars have arrived. Those who study these books will really know what is known about the Old Testament, its composition and its contents.

The most recent volume of the 'Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice,' edited by Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, discusses *The Place of the Laity in the Church* (Scott; 3s. net). It is a matter which every Church in Christendom is discussing. It is a matter that will surely demand discussion and more than discussion in the reconstruction following the war. The authors of the chapters in this volume are scarcely aware of its urgency. They are constitutionally conservative, and use old arguments over again, though perhaps with an occasional quail of conscience. They refuse to narrow the distance that separates clergy from laity in the Church of England, and somewhat in the manner of Lord Milner on a celebrated occasion, but more reverently, they are ready to face the consequences.

There are some small matters in the book which the Editor has overlooked. The Episcopal Church in Scotland is called 'The Church of Scotland,' and

that too in the heading of a chapter. On another page we find 'the minister of Grey Friars Chapel, Glasgow.'

Mr. J. Ellis has added to his large library of Preachers' Aids a volume of Outline Addresses, Children's Talks, and the like, to which he has given the title *Tools Ready to Hand* (Scott; 2s. net). Among the anecdotes at the end there is this reminiscence of Lincoln: 'President Lincoln, being once asked after a long voyage along the coast on a steamboat, how he was, replied: "I am not feeling very well. I got pretty badly shaken up on the bay coming along, and am not altogether over it yet." "Let me send for a bottle of champagne for you, Mr. President," said a staff-officer; "that is the best remedy I know of for sea-sickness." "No, no, no, my young friend," replied the President, "I've seen many a man in my time sea-sick ashore from drinking that very article." That was the last time any one screwed up sufficient courage to offer him wine.'

The Rev. Henry Phipps Denison, B.A., has given an account of the things which are most surely believed by himself in a volume entitled *The Making of Gods* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net). For example. He believes that faith is a faculty of the soul, bestowed upon it at conversion. Before conversion no one has faith or can have it. And as conversion occurs in baptism, no unbaptized person can have faith. Then the use of faith is to enable us to know God. And as God is known only in Jesus Christ, faith is always and only faith in Him.

In the middle of the book we come upon the chapter on Idolatry. It explains the title. In every revolt against Catholic tradition there are three stages—panic, the making of gods, degradation. The illustration is the Golden Calf. The departure 'may be in the heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries, it may be in the manufacture of Protestantism in the Lutheran workshop, or it may be in the twentieth-century revolt of intellectualism and Kultur.' Well, Mr. Denison thinks for himself. Is it possible that he may awake some morning and find himself a heretic or even a Protestant?

A notable volume on *Religion and Reconstruction* has been published by Messrs. Skeffington (3s. 6d.).



net). It is made up of papers contributed by thirteen men, every man of them a far-seeing spectator of the present conflict and a deeply interested student of its religious aspect. There is no attempt to furnish dry facts. That is done elsewhere and sufficiently. The aim is to manifest a spirit. And that is accomplished here as nowhere else yet. The writers include Deans and Bishops of the Church of England, a Monsignor of the Roman Church, together with representatives of the Nonconformist Churches, and the spirit of unity is perfect. There is not even a sign of reserve.

Another volume has appeared of that most appetizing series 'The Making of the Future,' edited by Patrick Geddes and Victor Branford. It has itself the appetizing title of *Human Geography in Western Europe* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). The author, Mr. H. J. Fleure, is after the editors' heart. For he can sympathize with

the human race regardless of clime or colour, and he can write. He is Professor in the University of Wales at Aberystwyth.

But what is Human Geography? It is the study of man in the place wherein he dwells. The place is never lost sight of, but the geography is of the men who live there. 'The book,' says its author, 'is not intended to be a text-book of geography, it is rather an effort towards a closer contact with the ever-flowing stream of experience which has made of us, in the present competitive, in a better future more co-operative, groups that might work side by side for the enrichment of the life of humanity.'

We have all the joy of discovery as we read. It is a new study, and withal a new study of man. The very maps, if you can call them maps, are new. Our fathers tried to impart a human interest to their maps by painting in a native in full feathers here and there. This is a more artistic way; it is probably more scientific also.

## Some Aspects of Baptism in the New Testament.

BY PERCY J. HEAWOOD, M.A., PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM suggests various trains of thought. An English Churchman may perhaps begin by thinking of it as one of the two sacraments definitely recognized by his Church, and may think of a sacrament as defined in this connexion in the Catechism, as 'an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.' Yet it may well be that this idea of a sacrament is not the fundamental one. It is certainly not that suggested by the original classical meaning of the term—the oath of allegiance of the Roman soldier to his commander. To justify a divergent usage we are often reminded that in the early Christian centuries the word *sacramentum* came to be applied in a very general way to any sacred rite or function, and in particular St. Augustine's use of the word (in *Ep.* 138. i. 7) is referred to, where he says that 'signs when they apply to divine things are called sacraments,' which at first seems something like the definition of a sacrament in the Catechism. Only we find in the context that Augustine is not defining Christian sacraments or even alluding

directly to them. He is meeting a curious objection that God showed caprice in first ordaining Jewish sacrifices and then superseding them by Christian ordinances. Matters of outward ritual he shows are not an expression of God's unchangeable nature, but are relative to man's varying needs. They are for man's benefit, not for God's pleasure, and therefore liable to vary with circumstances; they are naturally different before Christ's coming and after He had come. This he argues at some length, but waives the detailed application of the principle to all the various symbolic acts of the old and new covenants, the 'signs' which in divine matters are called 'sacraments.' 'Nimis autem longum est,' he says, 'convenienter disputare de varietate signorum, quae cum ad res divinas pertinent sacramenta vocantur.' He goes on to point out that such a change of 'sacraments' had been foretold. This general incidental reference does not perhaps after all show how the term came to be applied, say, to the Christian rite of Baptism, nor do other more vague and general usages



explain the special emphasis with which it was used of that and some other Christian rites.<sup>1</sup> We have not to go beyond the baptismal service itself for hints that, whatever may be the precise history of the word, the original reference to the soldier's oath may have more bearing on the matter than appears at first. Though the prevalence of infant baptism leads to more stress on what is done *for* than what is done *by* the baptized person, it is yet plainly set forth as a condition that the child must (by its sureties) renounce the devil and all his works, express willingness to be baptized in the Faith of the Apostles' Creed, and promise to keep God's commandments. These things are solemnly 'demanded' by the minister. Moreover, the child is signed with the sign of the cross, 'in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end.' Baptism then, whatever else it is, is enlistment in Christ's service, under the most solemn vows of faithful continuance therein. It involves a *sacramentum* in the literal sense. But then there is the other side—the ritual acts, the prayers and their implications, the ideas of regeneration, of admission to the membership of the Church. What is the relation between these various aspects?

With such questions in view, we turn to see what impression we gather from the various references to baptism in the New Testament. It is the baptism from which John Baptist took his name, and which seems so strangely to have persisted, with personal reference to him (Ac 18<sup>25</sup> 19<sup>3,4</sup>), which meets us in the very forefront of the gospel. John proclaimed, 'Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' and then there 'went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins' (Mt 3<sup>1-6</sup>); but we are not clearly told what was the significance of the rite. It is introduced as a natural thing which seems to have been popularly accepted and understood, and obviously it had a

history behind it; but beyond the fact that it is supposed to have been used for the admission of proselytes the history is obscure. From its symbolism we might naturally think of cleansing and of ceremonies of purification, yet there seems nothing at all like it in the ceremonial of the Jewish law. One thing seems clear—that it was intended as the sequel to repentance and confession of sin and symbolized the start on a new life to which repentance led. It is called the Baptism of Repentance (Mk 1<sup>4</sup>, Lk 3<sup>3</sup>, Ac 19<sup>4</sup>). Yet Jesus offered Himself for it, though John's protest brought the reply that it was fitting for Him (and His) to 'fulfil all righteousness' (Mt 3<sup>15</sup>). Josephus says that John urged the Jews to baptism if they were practising justice to each other and piety towards God, adding in rather striking words that John approved the rite if it were used 'not to get off certain sins'<sup>2</sup> but to purify the body, on the assumption that the soul had been already thoroughly cleansed by righteousness, *i.e.* apparently it was to be used as an outward sign of an inward change which was deemed to have already taken place, not as a means of securing it (Ant. 18. 5. 2). But the act of baptizing was thought to involve high personal claims. 'Why then baptizest thou, if thou art not the Christ, neither Elijah, neither the prophet?' asked the priests and Levites from Jerusalem (Jn 1<sup>25</sup>). And we soon find other personal implications. The Pharisees had heard 'that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John (although Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples),' Jn 4<sup>1,2</sup>, as though baptism were thought of as admitting to a personal relationship. We hear no more of baptism during Christ's ministry, but all that had gone before leads up to those ideas of discipleship and personal relation to Christ which we find associated with it when baptism is finally appropriated to the admission of believers into the Church, as in the charge to 'go and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost' (Mt 28<sup>19</sup>). So in the sequel the idea of personal allegiance is prominent.

<sup>2</sup> μή ἐπὶ τινῶν ἀμαρτιῶν παραιτήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προεκκεκαθαμένῃς. It is a little tempting to suppose a noun *τίνης* (or *τίνος*) from *τινῶν*, as *τρίβης* from *τρίβω*. 'Not for begging off the penalties of sins' makes excellent sense, while the direct dependence of ἀμαρτιῶν on παραιτήσει is a little harsh and τινῶν = 'some' rather pointless. In default of evidence for such a word, however, this cannot be pressed.

<sup>1</sup> In *Confessions*, IV. ii. 3, Augustine speaks of the rites by which a soothsayer offered to secure his success in a prize-poem competition as 'foeda illa sacramenta,' but they may be so described not merely as rites but as aiming at a *league* with powers of evil. The man (he says) by his sacrifices of animals 'invitaturus mihi suffragatura daemonia videbatur.'



St. Paul found disciples at Ephesus, who had been baptized 'into John's baptism' (Ac 19<sup>3</sup>). John, in baptizing with the Baptism of Repentance, pointed on, he told them, to belief in Him that was coming after him, namely, Jesus; and 'hearing this they were baptized *into the name of the Lord Jesus*.' In writing to Corinth, St. Paul thanks God that he had baptized so few of the Corinthians himself (1 Co 1<sup>14, 15</sup>), 'lest any man should say that *ye were baptized into my name*.' So prominent seems to be the idea of personal allegiance associated with the rite. When St. Paul himself is baptized at Damascus, Ananias brings forward the idea of purification (Ac 22<sup>16</sup>): 'Arise, and be baptized (or baptize thyself<sup>1</sup>) and wash away thy sins'—and indeed he had a special past of rebellion, from which to purge himself. But he continues at once *ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, which, however translated, brings in the note of personal allegiance, of baptism into Christ's name, which we have found elsewhere. If rightly rendered here 'calling upon' or 'invoking his name' (and not rather 'calling his name upon thyself,' as might be suggested by the more Hebraic passages which are direct quotations from the Old Testament where . . . שָׁם יְקָרָא . . . לֵךְ is used<sup>2</sup>) the phrase will still involve the personal appropriation of Christ's name. In 1 Co 1<sup>2</sup> and elsewhere *οἱ ἐπικαλοῦμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου* is used to describe those who are Christians, who accept the Lord as their Lord; and so the name 'invoked' in baptism, if that be the sense, will be the name invoked in a special way as that of the Master to whom the disciple vows allegiance, or the phrase loses its point. But the expression in Ja 2<sup>7</sup>, 'the noble name which was called upon *yōu*' (*τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*), suggests the fuller meaning in other passages where *ἐπικαλοῦμαι* is used.

But, further, the incidents from the Old Testament which are used in the New as types or illustrations of baptism are not a little remarkable, or would be if we were not so familiar with them—not ceremonial washings or purifications, but rather the great deliverances which gave a fresh

<sup>1</sup> The verb is middle (as in 1 Co 10<sup>2</sup>), and in the second clause at all events the action seems to be attributed to the baptized.

<sup>2</sup> As in Ac 15<sup>17</sup>, quoting Am 9<sup>12</sup>; but there are various uses of יָקָר like import, as יָקָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְקָרָא (Is 44<sup>5</sup>), 'shall call himself by the name of Jacob' (among a variety of parallel phrases using other verbs), and so it may be in the Greek.

start to the nation or the race, that of Noah and his family from the flood (1 P 3<sup>20-21</sup>) and of Israel at the passage of the Red Sea (1 Co 10<sup>1-4</sup>). In each case the water is there; but as a destructive not a purifying agent, through which, however, those concerned were brought safely, while it put an impassable barrier between the old and the new life. If we look at the non-religious uses of the words we find that, while *βάπτω* means to dip, *βαπτίζω* is used not of mere immersion but of drowning or overwhelming, both in a literal and a figurative sense. One of the strangest cases is where Josephus says (*B.J.* iv. iii. 3) of the robber bands which poured into Jerusalem, *ἐβάπτισαν τὴν πόλιν*, in the sense apparently that they flooded (and as it were overwhelmed) the city, for he explains it by saying that resources which might have sufficed for the fighting men were thus wasted on a useless and idle mob. While this gives a curious sidelight on the associations of the word, we note again in the Red Sea illustration an insistence on the element of personal devotion, where we might not expect to find it. 'All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and all were *baptized unto Moses*<sup>3</sup> in the cloud and in the sea' (1 Co 10<sup>1-2</sup>). We read in Ex 14<sup>31</sup>, as the result of their deliverance, that 'the people feared the Lord and believed in the Lord and in Moses his servant'; and St. Paul seems to think of the event as sealing the acceptance of Moses as their leader, and to find in this, as much as in their safe passage through the water, the point of the parallel with Christian baptism.

In 1 Peter the figure of Noah's flood is suggested in connexion with the mysterious preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison which of old were disobedient. For them the long-suffering of God had waited in vain while the Ark was preparing. And this leads the writer on to notice that as by it (when the flood came) a few were brought in safety through the water, so answering to this figure baptism now saves us. And then he pauses to suggest in a remarkable phrase wherein the essential virtue of baptism consists—*οὐ σαρκὸς ἀποθέσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν*. It is not the external bodily cleansing which saves us, but the 'answer' (A.V.), 'interrogation'<sup>4</sup> (R.V.), 'of a good conscience towards God.' The meaning of this word *ἐπερώτημα* has been much dis-

<sup>3</sup> Or baptized themselves—see above.

<sup>4</sup> Or 'inquiry' or 'appeal'—margin.



puted. It would naturally mean the 'question' or 'demand' or perhaps 'the thing demanded,' rather than the answer—hence the change in R.V. But it may help to a natural explanation if we notice how the verb *ἐπερωτάω* occurs in documents of the early Christian centuries. It is used in rather a special way of the formal demand made of one who had to make a legal declaration. 'Being asked the formal question, he assented' (*ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὁμολόγησεν*)—the phrase usually runs, with such small modifications as are due to differences of number and person. (See Grenfell and Hunt *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, in contracts *passim*.) An instance of the phrase in A.D. 170 (No. 905. 19) is indeed said to be an early example for Egypt 'apart from those in which Roman citizens are concerned'; but this limitation suggests that it or phrases akin to it may have been used elsewhere much earlier, and even in other connexions the word has a distinctly legal flavour. Once, in the papyri printed by G. and H., the noun *ἐπερωτήσις* occurs instead of the verb (*ἐπερωτήσεως γενομένης* 'the formal question having been put'—No. 1205. 9); and once or twice the perfect passive is used in a pregnant way, *as covering both the question and answer*, 'I have been asked the formal question as is laid down' (*ἐπηρώτημαι ὡς πρόκειται*—No. 1277. 14, 25), *where it is left to be understood that an affirmative answer was given*. Might not then *ἐπερωτήματα* in 1 Peter cover both the formal 'demand' and (by implication) the response to it, the assent given to the thing demanded? And the words *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς . . . εἰς θεόν* would imply that the answer—the profession of allegiance—was made out of the sincerity of a loyal heart. If so it was a happy instinct of the A.V. to render the word by 'answer' rather than 'demand,' though the latter is the more literal meaning. This is further borne out if we remember that the technical phrase for administering the oath of allegiance to a Roman soldier was '*sacramento rogare*' (Livy, 32. 26, 40. 26; Cæsar, *B.G.* 6. 1).<sup>1</sup> *The due response is implied*. As in modern administration of oaths, the promise to be sworn to would be put by the 'rogator,' and only assent would be required on the other side. We thus find again that baptism involves as its essence the profession of loyalty to

Christ. It is in a literal sense the *sacramentum* of allegiance to Him.

We may compare a noteworthy passage in St. Paul's epistle to the Romans (10<sup>9, 10</sup>): 'If thou shalt confess<sup>2</sup> with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.' It is true that in this place there is no explicit mention of baptism, but what else should this open confession be, to which such saving grace is assigned, but the baptismal confession (the avowal of an honest heart of allegiance to Christ, as we have been regarding it), when we are told here that the point of the confession is the recognition of Jesus as Lord? Moreover, while St. Paul links with this outward confession belief in the heart that God raised Christ from the dead, St. Peter tells us that Baptism saves us *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ*.

This brings us naturally to another aspect of the matter, the remarkable way in which Baptism is connected in the New Testament with Christ's death and resurrection. In 1 Peter the whole passage containing the reference to Baptism arises out of the consideration of Christ's unmerited sufferings, 'the just for the unjust,' and of the new life through death which resulted. He was 'put to death in the flesh but made alive in the spirit,' and we are to 'arm ourselves with the same mind' (1 P 3<sup>18</sup> 4<sup>1, 6</sup>). But in St. Paul the reference is more direct. While he finds in baptism the pledge of unity,<sup>3</sup> in the one faith, owning the one Lord (Eph 4<sup>5</sup>), it is on its connexion with Christ's death that he insists with peculiar emphasis. 'Know ye not that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life' (Ro 6<sup>3, 4</sup>). So in Col 2<sup>12</sup>: 'Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead.' And this comparison, which might seem strange, is explained by the context in Ro 6, where we see

<sup>1</sup> Obvius in agris sacramento rogatus arma capere et sequi cogebat — imperatum est ut Petillius . . . omnes minores quinquaginta annis sacramento roget. — quos ex Cisalpina Gallia consul sacramento rogasset. . . .

<sup>2</sup> It may be worth noting that the word for 'confess' here is the same as that so often linked with *ἐπερωτηθεὶς* in the papyri in the legal phrase, 'Being asked the formal question, he assented,' as noted above.

<sup>3</sup> Compare 1 Co 12<sup>13</sup>.



that baptism is regarded not as a mere cleansing process, but as symbolizing the death of the old self, crucified with Christ, and the 'putting on of the new man' to whom 'Christ is all and in all' (Col 3<sup>10-11</sup>). We see how all this fits with the full force of βαπτίζω as meaning literally to overwhelm or drown, with the illustrations from startling and tragic deliverances in the Old Testament, and with the primitive Eastern mode of baptism by plunging in the rushing flood.<sup>1</sup> And here we may remember that Christ's Passion is itself spoken of by Him as a baptism: 'I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished' (Lk 12<sup>50</sup>). We easily accept the metaphor, as indeed we speak sometimes of a baptism of fire or a baptism of blood; but is it merely used here as it might be used of anything overwhelming, that had a religious or moral significance, and from which the sufferer emerged victorious or purified? The crisis is there, the tragic catastrophe, the deliverance from death; but if we follow a hint in St. Paul's epistle to Timothy we may find in it a still more essential element. Timothy has just been reminded that he had 'confessed the good confession in the sight of many witnesses,' and the writer proceeds to lay a charge upon him in the sight of God . . . and of Christ Jesus *who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession* (1 Ti 6<sup>12-13</sup>), an aspect of His Passion which might not have been so prominent in our minds, but which thus explicitly connects it with that confession, on our part, of His name, which seems the very pith and marrow of the baptismal rite.

And may not this view of baptism and its connexion with Christ's death and resurrection even throw light on that much-disputed passage in 1 Co 15<sup>20</sup>: 'Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all why are they then baptized for them?' The words may remind us in a general way of Isaiah's indignant בער החיים אל-המתים, 'On behalf of the living—unto the dead!' (Is 8<sup>19</sup>); but it is not easy to get any but a far-fetched explanation, unless we understand the reference in 'the dead' to be to Christ Himself, on the supposition that He is dead and not risen. 'To be baptized for the dead' will then mean 'to be baptized for one who is, on this

showing, dead.' If we remember how closely St. Paul connects baptism with His death *and resurrection*, this reference seems in many ways the simplest and most natural. If Christ has not been raised from the dead, those who have been baptized into His name have been baptized into a death which has in it no promise of life. The use of the plural—the class for the individual representative of the class—is surely not unnatural in a passage where the gist of the argument has been that 'if there is no resurrection of *the dead* neither hath Christ been raised,' 'Christ . . . whom he raised not up, if so be that *the dead* are not raised,' 'if *the dead* are not raised neither hath Christ been raised' (vv. 13-16). And as what is true universally of the class is true of the individual member, so the case of the member is a case of the class to which he belongs. Such a use of a general term where the reference is particular does not much trouble us elsewhere. In the account of the healing of the paralytic (Mt 9<sup>8</sup>) we read that the multitudes 'were afraid, and glorified God, who had given such power unto men' (τὸν δόντα ἔξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις) where it was only in the person of one that 'men' had received it. Another instance may be given from the Old Testament; perhaps it is a Hebrew trait thus to merge the individual in the class. We read (Gn 21<sup>7</sup>), 'Who would have said unto Abraham that Sarah should give *children* suck' (היניקה בנים שרה), while the whole emphasis of the story is on there being only one such child. The real impediment to the acceptance of this suggestion seems to be the preposition ὑπέρ. If it were asked what use there was in being baptized *into the name of the dead*, the plural would not trouble us, and we might feel that a reason for the vaguer phrase could be found in a shrinking from speaking directly of Christ as dead, for purposes of argument. What pulls us up is that we are not so used to think of being baptized *for* Christ. We think of baptism as a rite performed (by someone) for the benefit of the baptized person, to bring him into a covenant relation with God, or to bring him God's grace and forgiveness. But if it *primarily* involves the confession of Christ's name, the enlistment in His service, being baptized for Him is equivalent to being admitted into service for Him,<sup>2</sup> and we can take St. Paul's sentence in the way proposed without any feeling of harshness.

<sup>1</sup> We may compare what John says about baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire (Mt 3<sup>11, 12</sup> and parallels), and again the reference to baptism with the Holy Ghost,—of His descent with overwhelming power on the Day of Pentecost (Ac 1<sup>5</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> In Ph 1<sup>20</sup> belief in Christ as well as suffering for Him is thought of as being ὑπέρ Χριστοῦ.



But be that as it may,—whatever be thought of the interpretation of this particular passage, the idea on which it is based is simply that to which everything has pointed, that in baptism it is the answer of a loyal heart which is the secret of its saving grace, as we are taught by St. Peter; the confession, with the mouth, of Jesus as Lord, which brings salvation, in the language of St. Paul. We have already seen how much in the baptismal service bears out this point of view, with its emphasis on the position of the baptized as Christ's faithful soldier and servant. In the final exhortation too we are reminded that 'Baptism doth represent unto us our profession.' And all would admit that there are conditions on man's part which must be fulfilled. Yet the prevalence of the baptism of unconscious infants,<sup>1</sup> even though they make protestation by their 'sureties,' and still more the fact that baptism is so often administered in a semi-private manner and is not in any real sense a confession before the assembled congregation, as it is meant to be, tends to make people's thoughts drift in unfortunate directions. Questions are often raised as to what constitutes valid baptism, what are the benefits of baptism, what is given in baptism, and why the grace of God is secured by the administration of a ceremonial rite. Such puzzles disappear when it is realized that the rite is but the formal acknowledgment and acceptance by the Church, the seal set by Christ's ordinance, to that true confession of His name, on which its spiritual significance depends. Not that this in any way minimizes the part of divine grace and its regenerating power, rather the other way; but it is divine grace meeting a real spiritual effort, not as it were drawn from heaven by a ceremonial act. The outward observance, it is true, was ordained by Christ Himself; but the part it plays is like that of the formal setting of the seal to a document, which is the crowning legal attestation of a transaction which derives all its real

validity from the contract, the payment, etc., which have been already made. To paraphrase St. Paul's words with respect to the rite of admission to the old covenant (Ro 4<sup>11</sup>) baptism is the outward sign, the seal, of the righteousness of the faith which the faithful receiver had when yet unbaptized. We may learn something even from the words of Josephus already quoted, where he tells us that John urged baptism only for those whose souls had been already cleansed.

We have reviewed the history of baptism<sup>1</sup> in the New Testament and tried to see what light a comprehensive survey may throw on various difficult passages; but it is not merely a question of exegesis, nor chiefly a matter of theological, or archæological, or philological interest, but one of living reality. We hear a great deal nowadays of the readjustment of values, in accordance with the real bearing of things on human life and conduct. It is of at least equal importance to recover the true values of those permanent things which need no transvaluation, but of which the true values become obscured by a crust of insincerity or blind traditionalism. The power of the Church in the world largely depends on its being clear what admission to Christian membership really involves. The prevalence of traditional membership or nominal adherence, which may mean anything or nothing, is a terrible weakening of this power. To a large extent this is unavoidable. Christ Himself has warned us that in His Church there will always be wheat and tares, and that no one must think to root out the tares, lest he root up also the wheat with them; but at least we can see to it that the meaning of admission to Christ's Church, in all its reality and power, is kept before the eyes of men, as involving essentially the public confession of His name,—enlistment in the service of a living Christ.

<sup>1</sup> The discussion began with the general consideration of the term 'Sacraments' as applied to baptism and the Lord's Supper in the Catechism. Something might have been said of the application of the term to the latter, but the consideration of baptism has been sufficient by itself to form a rounded whole. To introduce other questions might only confuse the issue.

<sup>1</sup> This of course makes it necessary that the complete idea of baptism can only be realized as supplemented by confirmation, when years of discretion are reached.



## In the Study.

### Barzillai.

'Now Barzillai was a very aged man, even fourscore years old.'—2 Sam 19<sup>32</sup>.

'The hoary head is a crown of glory, if it be found in the way of righteousness.'—Pr 16<sup>31</sup>.

THERE was a favourite saying of Ptolemy the astronomer which Bacon thus quotes in Latin and Matthew Arnold in English: *Quum fini appropinquas, bonum cum augmento operare*—'As you draw near to your latter end, redouble your efforts to do good.'

It is surely a fitting quotation with which to open a study of Barzillai the Gileadite, for in him we see a grand fulfilment of the precept. He was one whose sympathies seemed to keep alive, if not to grow, as years advanced. Long before St. Peter wrote his Epistles, Barzillai had been taught by the one Master to 'put away all wickedness, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and evil-speakings'; and he had adopted St. Paul's rule for rich men, 'that they do good, that they be rich in good works, that they be ready to distribute, willing to communicate.'

### I.

#### A HIGHLAND CHIEF.

The few verses in the seventeenth and nineteenth chapters of Second Samuel tell a beautiful little story. It is of the kind that, although read a thousand times, never grows old. David had been chased about by a most cruel disloyalty and unfilial ingratitude and rebellion; things had indeed gone very hardly with him.

He and his companions had taken refuge in the strong fortress at Mahanaim in Barzillai's country. Owing to their hurried flight, the fugitives were wanting in almost all the necessities of life, and they could hardly fail also to have been a little apprehensive of the kind of welcome the Gileadites would extend to them. But if so, their fears were soon set at rest. Three of the richest and most influential men in the district at once came to their aid—Shobi the son of Nahash, and Machir the son of Ammiel, and Barzillai the Gileadite of Rogelim. They brought beds, and cups, and wheat, and barley, and honey, and butter, and

sheep—all, in fact, that was needed—for David, and for the people that were with him: for they said, 'The people is hungry, and weary, and thirsty, in the wilderness' (2 Sam 17<sup>29</sup>).

1. Of Shobi and Machir we already know a very little; but of Barzillai's previous history we know next to nothing. We are not even told where exactly Rogelim was. But the few facts stated with regard to him are suggestive. In 19<sup>31</sup> we read that 'Barzillai the Gileadite came down from Rogelim,' and conclude that Rogelim was among the mountains of Gilead. Again in v. 32 we are told that he was 'a very great man.' Barzillai enjoyed the 'blessing of the Old Testament' prosperity; and dwelling as he did among the hills, his only occupation and main way of becoming rich must have been as a farmer.

He was rich apparently both in flocks and in servants, a kind of chief or sheikh, not only with a large establishment of his own, but enjoying the respect, and in some degree able to command the services, of many of the humble people around him.

Sheikh Fareij spent the evening in our tent, and greatly interested us by his dignified manner and intelligence, and by a certain air of sadness that pervaded his whole conversation and deportment. He lamented that the ancient, generous customs of the Bedawin were being corrupted by Turkish oppression. They now robbed one another, and even murder is often added to plunder. 'I myself,' he added, 'live day by day by the life of this good sword,' striking his hand fiercely upon the formidable tool at his side. He admitted that, without my guide from the emeer, I could not have reached his tent in safety; and that without similar assistance from himself, I should not be able to proceed on the morrow round the eastern shore of the lake. Of the truth of this I had certain and rather startling evidence next morning; for I found myself suddenly confronted by a troop of the most savage Bedawin I ever encountered, and they made no secret of the fact that they were restrained from plundering us solely by the guard from Sheikh Fareij.<sup>1</sup>

2. Barzillai was a man of courageous loyalty. His name signifies a man of iron. Such indeed he was. No lath painted to look like iron was he, but a veritable man of iron. He stood like a tower of strength foursquare to all the winds that blew. And the winds were very tempestuous.

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 353.



It was dangerous just then to associate oneself publicly with King David, to help or succour him and his retinue. Cautious people were specially cautious. The sitters on the fence were numerous. Trimmers abounded as they are wont to abound in danger's hour. Those whose eye was ever for self-interest hesitated and indeed declined to rally to David and his forlorn band.

But what did Barzillai do? He with a faithful few like minded left all 'prudential' considerations to take care of themselves, and forth he fared from his castle at Rogelim to David's headquarters at Mahanaim.

Living as he did in a sequestered part of the country, there was no call on him to declare himself at that particular moment; and if Absalom got the upper hand, he would be sure to punish severely those who had been active on his father's side. But none of these things moved Barzillai. He was no sunshine courtier, willing to enjoy the good things of the court in days of prosperity, but ready in darker days to run off and leave his friends in the midst of danger. He was one of those true men that are ready to risk their all in the cause of loyalty when persuaded that it is the cause of truth and right.

Jaurès was a patriot in the highest and purest sense of the word. He loved France with the Hebrew prophet's love of Israel, he loved her with an intensity of which the ordinary patriot is incapable. He could 'easily scorn delights and live laborious days' for her welfare. He had a vision of her glorious destiny in which he really believed as few men believe in anything, and love of one's country was in his eyes a natural, a healthy, and a fundamental instinct.<sup>1</sup>

3. Barzillai was ready not only to risk all but to lose all, if necessary, in a cause which appeared so obviously to be Divine, all the more because he saw what a blessing David had been to the country. Why, he had actually made the kingdom. Not only had he expelled all its internal foes, but he had cowed those troublesome neighbours that were constantly pouncing upon the tribes, and especially the tribes situated in Gilead and Bashan. Moreover, he had given unity and stability to all the internal arrangements of the kingdom. What a grand capital he had made for it at Jerusalem. He had planted the ark on the strongest citadel of the country, safe from every invading foe. He had perfected the arrangements for the service of the Levites, what a delightful service of song he

had instituted, and what beautiful songs he had composed for the use of the sanctuary. Doubtless it was considerations of this kind that roused Barzillai's loyalty to such a high pitch.

Let Christian men lay it on their consciences to pay regard to the claims under which they lie to serve their country. Whether it be in the way of serving on some public board, or fighting against some national vice, or advancing some great public interest, let it be considered even by busy men that their country and, we must add, their Church have true claims upon them. Even heathen and unbelievers have said, 'It is sweet and glorious to die for one's country.' It is a poor state of things when in a Christian community men are so sunk in indolence and selfishness that they will not stir a finger on its behalf.

The greatest service rendered by Young Italy was through its martyrs. In one city after another, men mounted the scaffold in behalf of their country which was to be, and that scaffold became a shrine of patriotism. Hundreds of enthusiasts languished in prisons, but not forgotten. Their sacrifice stimulated the zeal of their comrades and attracted the attention, if not the sympathy, of the timid or torpid public. The smug conservative might feel inclined to exclaim, 'Poor fool! Another of Mazzini's dupes!' but he could not dismiss the fact of the 'poor fool's' devotion, nor could he deny that under the magic of Mazzini's evangel Italy had become a cause for which Italians cheerfully risked fortune, home and life. The dumb populace that watched a handful of zealots being led to execution or a coffin of heavily chained victims being driven like beasts to the galleys, could not fail to be impressed.<sup>2</sup>

## II.

### A KING'S OFFER.

1. With the death of its leader, the rebellion against David may be said to have ended, but to the sorrow-stricken father victory at such a price seemed an almost greater calamity than defeat would have been. It needed the remonstrances of Joab to rouse him from his grief and lead him to think of his duty to his people. On the homeward journey David followed the same route as that by which a little while before he had fled, and on the bank of the Jordan he had his final parting with Barzillai. The loyal chieftain, notwithstanding his eighty years, had come all the way from his upland farm to bid farewell to his king, and see him safely over Jordan. And as David remarked the old man's devotion, and remembered his former

<sup>1</sup> Margaret Pease, *Jean Jaurès*, 126.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Thayer, *The Life and Times of Cavour*, i. 241.



favours, the wish seized him to attach him still more closely to his person. 'Come thou over with me,' he said, 'and I will feed thee with me in Jerusalem' (2 Sam 19<sup>88</sup>).

Barzillai had been helpful to David in his trials and triumphs; but it was not the mere food (17<sup>28, 29</sup>) which he, with others, brought that gave strength to David's heart and raised his hope in God. The hoary head, crowned with the glory of true goodness, had been more to David than all the material supplies. To have the friendship and the kindly attentions of a venerable man of God was to the king a real spring of new life and vigour. The vain and trifling young man might go off to take sides with rebellion, but age, with its wisdom, its deep experience, its large-heartedness and settled piety, was with him. As cold water to a thirsty soul was the loyalty and affection of so honoured a man. It is a blessing and real help to have the favour and sympathy of men who have had large experience in life, and have won for themselves imperishable honours; and, though the infirmities of age may seem to set a narrow limit to the usefulness of the aged, yet their moral power is very great. Their influence is quiet, but real and pervading. The tone they impart to home affects the world outside, and their known interest in Christ's servants and the work they are doing is power and cheer to many a heart.

Barzillai had seen enough of David to know that what the king said he meant, and that if he chose to go with him, honour and position awaited him at the court. But he would not be moved. His grey hairs, if nothing else, stood in the way. 'How long have I to live,' he answered, 'that I should go up with the king unto Jerusalem?' (v. 34). I am too old, that is, for such a life as would there be expected of me. And, after all, why should conduct such as mine meet with so great a reward? No! let me go a little way over Jordan with the king, and then, 'Let thy servant, I pray thee, turn back again, that I may die in mine own city, and be buried by the grave of my father and of my mother.'

Barzillai knew that David's court was no place for him; he had been bred on the mountains of Gilead, and his habits suited only a simple country life. The court might be better, but he could not fit into it. But there was his boy Chimham—'Behold thy servant Chimham'; 'let him go over with my lord the king; and do to him what shall

seem good unto thee' (v. 37). With a plea so expressed David could not but acquiesce; 'The king kissed Barzillai, and blessed him; and he returned unto his own place . . . and Chimham went on with him' (vv. 39, 40).

The late Dr. Husband of Dunfermline called on a friend when he was preparing to set out on a short journey, and was beginning to ask him some questions as to the place grace held in the Divine economy. 'Come away wi' me, and I'll expound that; but when I'm speaking, look you after my feet.' They got upon a rough bit of common, and the eager and full-minded old man was in the midst of his unfolding the Divine scheme, and his student was drinking in his words, and forgetting his part of the bargain. His master stumbled and fell, and getting up, somewhat sharply said, 'James, the grace o' God can do much, but it canna gie a man common sense'; which is as good theology as sense.<sup>1</sup>

2. Chimham took his father's place, and, with his descendants, long remained in Western Palestine, a witness of the loyalty of the Eastern tribes.

David and Barzillai never met again on earth. Before David had finished his career, the venerable man had passed away to his blessed reward. But it could not but be, as was evident from his charge to Solomon, that throughout his life David cherished the memory of the good old man, and found, amid the cares and sorrows of life much comfort therein. The vision of that bent form, laden with precious fruits of a long and godly experience, bending before him and bidding him God-speed in his high vocation, would often rise up and again cheer his spirit.

The heart well purged by humility is so deeply conscious of its unworthiness, that to receive acts of kindness always excites some emotion of gratitude, of shame, of surprise, or all three together—of gratitude for the benefit, of shame upon thinking how ill it is deserved, of surprise that our brethren should bestow upon us what we so little merit.<sup>2</sup>

Dean Stanley in his *History of the Jewish Church* says that 'four miles out of Jerusalem, under the King's own patronage, a celebrated caravanserai for travellers into Egypt—the first halting-place on their route—was founded by Chimham, son of Barzillai, on the property granted to him by David out of the paternal patrimony of Bethlehem. The caravanserai remained with Chimham's name for at least four centuries, and, according to the immovable usages of the East, it probably was the same which, at the time of the Christian era, furnished shelter for two travellers with their infant Child, when—"there was no room in the inn," and when they too from that spot fled into Egypt.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Brown, *Rab and his Friends*, ii. 69.

<sup>2</sup> D. C. Lathbury, *Correspondence on Church and Religion* of William Ewart Gladstone, ii. 159.

<sup>3</sup> A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, ii. 154.



## III.

## A BEAUTIFUL OLD AGE.

1. Barzillai contemplated his death. 'That I may die in mine own city, and be buried by the grave of my father and of my mother,' is the pathetic desire he expresses to David (2 Sam 19<sup>87</sup>).

He understood what was suitable for old age. Many a man, and woman too, perhaps, even of Barzillai's years, would have jumped at King David's offer, and rejoiced to share the dazzling honours of a court, and would have affected youthful feelings and habits in order to enjoy the exhilaration and the excitement of a courtier's life. In Barzillai's choice, we see the predominance of a sanctified common sense, alive to the proprieties of things, and able to see how the enjoyment most suitable to an advanced period of life might best be had. It was not by aping youth or grasping pleasures for which the relish had gone. Some may think this a painful view of old age. Is it so that as years multiply the taste for youthful enjoyments passes away, and one must resign oneself to the thought that life itself is near its end? Undoubtedly it is. But even a heathen could show that this is by no means an evil.

'It is not for an old man like me to go up to Jerusalem,' Dr. Whyte makes Barzillai say in his *Bible Characters*. 'My time is past to be eating and drinking as they will eat and drink in Jerusalem when God sends back their king to his people. I would be a burden to myself and to the king's servants. I shall need all my time; for I am fourscore years old this day, and how shall I go up with the king to Jerusalem?' 'Who can help loyally the octogenarian Barzillai?' adds Dr. Whyte, 'with his "courtesy in conversation," and when, like Pompey in Plutarch, he "gave without disdain, and took with great honour."'<sup>1</sup>

2. Though we are never distinctly told so, we cannot doubt that Barzillai was a religious man. And as it was in gratitude to God for all that He had done to him that he first showed kindness to God's anointed, so it was in the same humble and trusting spirit that he accepted old age, and all that it involved when it came. That is by no means always the case. Are there not some who, as they look forward to the time of old age, if God should ever permit them to see it, do so with a certain amount of dread? They think only of what they will be called upon to abandon—the

duties they must give up, the pleasures, so dear to them now, they must forgo. But to Barzillai, the presence of such disabilities brought, as we have seen, no disquieting thoughts. He could relinquish, without a sigh, what he was no longer fitted to enjoy. He desired nothing but to end his days peacefully in his appointed lot. Enough for him that the God who had been with him all his life long was with him still.

Titus was instructed to exhort the aged men of Crete to be 'sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience.' It is a grievous thing to see grey hairs dishonoured. It is a humiliating sight when Noah excites either the shame or the derision of his sons. But 'the hoary head is a crown of glory, if it be found in the way of righteousness.' But what of those who dishonour God, and their own grey hairs, and the Church of Christ by stormy tempers, profane tongues, drunken orgies, and disorderly lives? 'O my soul, come not thou into their secret! To their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united!'<sup>2</sup>

To-day, my friend is seventy-five;  
He tells his tale with no regret;  
His brave old eyes are steadfast yet,  
His heart the lightest heart alive.

He sees behind him green and wide  
The pathway of his pilgrim years;  
He sees the shore, and dreadless hears  
The whisper of the creeping tide.

For out of all his days, not one  
Has passed and left its unlaidd ghost  
To seek a light for ever lost,  
Or wail a deed for ever done.

So for reward of life-long truth  
He lives again, as good men can,  
Redoubling his allotted span  
With memories of a stainless youth.<sup>3</sup>

## LITERATURE.

- Blaikie, W. G., *The Second Book of Samuel* (Expositor's Bible) (1888), 301.  
Hasell, E. J., *Bible Partings* (1883), 191.  
Jack, J., *A Great National Question* (1916), 19.  
Ker, J., *Sermons*, ii. (1887), 67.  
Koven, J. de, *Sermons* (1883), 263.  
Maclaren, A., *Expositions*: 2 Sam.—1 Kings (1906), 113.  
Milligan, G., in *Men of the Bible: Some Lesser-Known Characters* (1904), 31.  
Parker, J., *The City Temple Pulpit*, iii. (1900) 185.  
Simcox, W. H., *The Cessation of Prophecy* (1891), 123.  
Stanley, A. P., *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, ii. (1889) 26.

<sup>2</sup> W. G. Blaikie, *The Second Book of Samuel*, 313.

<sup>3</sup> H. Newbolt, *Poems New and Old*, 208.

<sup>1</sup> A. Whyte, *Bible Characters*: Ahithophel to Nehemiah, 40.



Whyte, A., *Bible Characters*: Ahithophel to Nehemiah, iii. (1899) 33.

Young, D. T., *Neglected People of the Bible* (1901), 92.

*Christian World Pulpit*, xlii. (1892) 290.

*Pulpit Commentary*: II Samuel (1888), 485.

## Virginibus Puerisque.

### I.

June.

#### THE LANGUAGE OF THE LEAVES.

'All the trees of the field shall clap their hands.'—Is 55<sup>12</sup>.

1. Boys and girls who are well are nearly always happy. They feel that it is a good thing to be alive. But of course doing what is wrong spoils everything. A Hindu trader in India said to a convert, 'What medicine do you put on your face to make it shine so?' 'I put nothing on,' answered the convert. 'What do you put on?' was again asked. 'Nothing; I don't put anything on.' 'Yes, you do, all you Christians do. I've seen it in Agra, and I've seen it in Bombay.' The convert laughed, and said: 'Yes, I'll tell you the medicine. It is having a happy heart.' That happy heart, boys and girls, is a thing that never goes with doing mean actions. You yourselves know that.

There should be much to make everyone happy in this leafy month of June. A blind girl used to be taken to walk in a wood near her own home, and she told me how she loved that wood in the sunny summer days. She felt the sun although she did not see it. 'Sometimes Jennie comes with me,' she said, mentioning another blind friend, 'then we sit underneath a tree and listen to the sound of the leaves. Sometimes we try to guess the names of the different trees.' 'They do clap their hands for us,' she added.

2. The chapter in Isaiah from which your text is taken is a very beautiful one. It is part of a great poem; and, as with other great poems, even when one does not understand every word of it a good reader can make this one seem like a piece of music. What is it all about, do you think? Just getting happiness from the things that God gives us for nothing—'without money, and without price,' like the music of the leaves on a June day, or the happiness that the Indian found from having formed a friendship with God.

I wonder how the people to whom it was first

addressed felt about it. They were men and women some of whom were sad, and others of whom were careless. They were really prisoners of war, and had been exiled from their homes. You boys and girls have learned to think affectionately of prisoners of war, have you not? Far away from their beloved country, in the great and busy city of Babylon, the sad ones remembered the old days, and the old home. Just as it is with our exiles those of long ago often longed to be back within sight of their own Jerusalem. Sometimes their conquerors would say, 'Give us a song.' 'Sing us one of the songs of Zion.' But their hearts were too sad for singing: you may know what it is to be told to sing when something is bringing a lump into your throat.

The others, the busy and careless ones, were the boys and girls who had been born in exile, and who had grown to be men and women in Babylon. To them, Babylon had, in a sense, become a home. As with the people of Alsace and Lorraine, the language of the country had become their language, and the ways of the great city had become their ways. They had learned to make money; some of them had become very wealthy indeed. So you see it was natural for them not to have the feeling of hatred towards their conquerors that the older generation had. They drank of the streams of Babylon and forgot about Zion. But I like to think of the little remnant who could remember the time when their old home meant a place where God was master, and when doing His will was the great ambition of their lives.

3. At last, after many years, these exiles were to be allowed to return to Jerusalem, and you can understand how it was that they were not all enthusiastic about going. The money-makers did not want to leave Babylon, and the spirit of the fathers and mothers was broken.

Isaiah's message was meant for both. There was an air of June about it. He did not scold the money-makers. He tried to turn their thoughts to higher things: the mountains, the hills, and the beauty of summer when the leaves of the trees seem to clap their hands with joy. Wasn't he a wise old prophet when he thus began his message to the workers who had become sordid in their efforts to get gain: 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come,



buy wine and milk without money and without price?'

4. Boys and girls, God's best blessings can be had without money and without price. Well do your exiled fathers and brothers know that. They cannot buy a sight of their native hills or a whiff of the sea air they love so well. But they know that nothing can separate them from your love or the love of the Great Father.

The trees of June bring us a message of God's love. How can we hear it? By having a clean heart. That is got by making Jesus Christ our Friend; no evil can dwell where He is.

Isaiah wanted to encourage the Israelites to return to their native land when he spoke of the beauty of God's earth, and how even the trees would cheer them on their way. Already God is saying to you boys and girls, 'I have a great work for you to do in this world; make up your minds to get ready for it. It may be harder work than your grandfathers ever had to do, but though in the meantime there is much sorrow in the world, God's sun still shines, and the leaves of the trees clap their hands as they did when they cheered on the captive Israelites to Jerusalem.'

But when the summer-time is here I love another book, Not told upon a printed page, but gurgled by a brook, And whispered by the eager pines, and thundered by the sea,

And gossiped in a dialect by every passing bee.

There is no story in the world which I have ever seen To equal Nature's volume, where the leaves are all of green.

The book is ever open at the most exciting page,  
To suit the reader old or young, of any taste and age;  
The pictures are in colours fair, the plot is ever new—  
However wild or wonderful, you know it all is true.

The book will last a lifetime long, and best of all, my friend,

Each summer 'tis 'continued,' and it never has an end!<sup>1</sup>

## II.

### The Trifles that Count.

'Who hath despised the day of small things.'—Zec 4<sup>10</sup>.

To-day I want to tell you two stories. The first story is about a weed, and the second is about a flower.

1. Did you ever hear of the Khaki Weed? It is a great pest in some parts of South Africa. And how do you think it came by its strange

name? Well, it was called the Khaki Weed because it was brought to South Africa at the time of the South African War. Before that time the weed was unknown in that country, but during the war great quantities of forage were brought from the Argentine, and among the forage were some seeds of this weed. Wherever the forage was unloaded the seeds blew about; and some of them liked the new ground and took root.

That was the beginning of it, but by no means the end. For the plant is one of those that stretch along the ground, and wherever a seed took root and grew the plant crept a little farther every day. Nowadays the weed has overgrown whole districts and has become such a nuisance that the farmers are ordered to destroy it. And all because of a few mischievous seeds that were blown about.

2. The second story is about a flower. So far as I know it never was more than one little flower. It didn't spread like the Khaki Weed, and yet it did a tremendous lot of good all by itself.

It grew more than a hundred years ago, in the days when Napoleon Bonaparte was Emperor of France.

There were many men in France then who did not agree with the Emperor or approve of his conduct, and some of these men Napoleon threw into prison. Among them was a wise scholar called Charney.

Now Charney was a clever man, but he had made one big mistake. He had given up believing in God. He had been so long in prison that he thought God had forgotten him, as the Emperor had, and that He no longer cared for him. So he wrote on the wall of his cell, 'All things come by chance.' He was so unhappy that he did not believe there was a God who watched over and cared for His creatures here below.

But one day when Charney was pacing up and down his cell he saw a tiny green blade trying to push its way through the hard ground quite near the wall. It was a tiny plant. How it came there I don't know. Perhaps God just sent it. The prisoner became interested in the little plant. It was the only living thing in the cell besides himself, and it became his friend and teacher. Day by day he watered it, and tended it, and watched it growing.

By and by a bud came on the plant, and presently the bud opened into a flower—a beautiful

<sup>1</sup> A. F. Brown, in *A Garland of Verse*, 198.

flower, white and purple and rose-coloured, with a white fringe round the edge.

Then Charney began to wonder and to think. He thought that if God could take so much care and trouble about a little prison flower, surely He must care for him. So he rubbed out the words he had written on the wall—'All things come by chance'—and in their place he wrote, 'He who made all things is God.'

Now in that great prison there was another prisoner whose little daughter used to visit him. And this little girl became acquainted with Charney. She found out about the flower and about Charney's love for it, and after that she often came to see it and the man who had befriended it.

One day she told the story of the flower to the jailer's wife, and the tale went from one to the other until at last it reached the ears of the beautiful Empress Josephine, Napoleon's wife. The Empress was very much interested. She was sure that a man who could care so much for a little flower could not have done anything very bad, and she persuaded her husband to set Charney free.

So at last Charney received his liberty. When he left the prison he took with him the little plant that had procured his release and, better still, had taught him to love and to trust God. And he planted it in his own garden and tended it ever after with the greatest love and care.

3. Now I don't need to say much about these two stories, but perhaps you have noticed that, each in its own way, they tell us very much the same thing—not to despise little things.

(1) *Don't despise the little bad things.*—They have a tremendous power for evil. Don't think it doesn't matter if you are just a little cross, just a little selfish, just a little mean, just a little untruthful or dishonest. Nobody ever started by being a big bit of any of them. These faults grow and spread like the Khaki Weed, and if we let them get big and strong it is almost impossible to root them out. The only safe way is to pluck them up when they are seedlings.

(2) *And don't despise the little good things.*—They have a tremendous power for good.

God takes as much trouble to make a speck of dust as to make a universe, and Jesus taught men the value of small things—a mustard seed, a grain of corn, a lily, a sparrow, a little child.

Take trouble to do the little things well even

though it is only running an errand, or writing a page in a copy-book. Once a boy at Rugby thought it did not matter how he wrote. Many men of genius, he said, wrote badly. And when he grew up he became an officer in the British Army and went out to fight in the Crimea. One day he copied an order so badly that it could not be properly read and was incorrectly given, and, as a result, many lives were lost.

(3) Once more, *don't despise the little opportunities* of being kind and doing good. Don't wait for the big ones to come along. Seize the small ones. Perhaps the big ones may never come your way, but the small ones may have big results. Remember the little prison flower. You can never tell where a good deed may end. You can never tell what a lot of good you may accomplish just by doing your duty and being helpful and loving.

Do what you can, being what you are;  
Shine like a glow-worm, if you cannot like a star,  
Work like a pulley, if you cannot be a crane,  
Be a wheel greaser, if you cannot drive the train.

### III.

#### Pleasant Words.

'Pleasant words are as a honeycomb.'—Pr 16<sup>24</sup>.

If King Solomon had lived in our day perhaps he would have written, 'Pleasant words are like sugar, sweet and wholesome,' for that is what he means in our text. But there was neither cane sugar nor beet sugar in Solomon's time, and any sweets he had were made with honey; so when he wanted to describe something sweet and good at the same time he compared it to the honey in the honeycomb.

Now, none of us is as wise as Solomon, but we are like him in this, that we love to hear pleasant words. We like when people say pleasant things to us. For instance, we like to know that we have done any piece of work well. If some one says of it, 'That's exceedingly good!' we feel that all the trouble we have taken is worth while. The kind word pays us for our labour.

1. But there are pleasant words *and* pleasant words. The first kind we are going to speak about is the *wrong kind*—the pretence kind, the kind that we call 'flattering.' Flattering words may sound all right, but we know they are false beneath. They are like poison hid in jam. The person who flatters you usually does it for a purpose, and



when a little voice inside tells you that what he says is untrue, beware!

A flatterer is like the toad who pretended to be a saucer of meal. He was a very cunning specimen—that toad. He lived in a farmyard near the chicken-coops, and he noticed that the flies which were his favourite food came in the evening to get supper from the saucers of meal and water which had been set out for the chickens. ‘Aha!’ thought the wily old boy, ‘why shouldn’t I pretend to be a saucer of meal?’ So he hopped along to one of the saucers, and rolled himself over and over in the meal, till he looked so mealy that you couldn’t tell where the meal ended and the toad began. Then he lay very still and waited. By and by the first fly arrived; he was followed by two or three, and they were followed by still others, and soon the pretence saucer of meal was covered with flies. But alas! for any silly fly who ventured too near the toad’s mouth. Out popped Mr. Toad’s tongue, and that poor fly disappeared for ever. The words of a flatterer may seem innocent and mealy, but take care! there’s danger beneath.

2. But what about the right kinds of pleasant words? for there are many right kinds. (1) Well, the commonest kind, and perhaps for that reason the kind that boys and girls think least about, is the *polite kind*. It is rather remarkable that there are lots of young people who seem to feel that politeness is unnecessary. More than that, they positively avoid it, as something that is affected, something that is good enough for ‘softies,’ but certainly not for them. So they drop out ‘Excuse me,’ and ‘I beg your pardon,’ and ‘I’m so sorry,’ and even ‘Please’ and ‘Thank you,’ and they stick in grunts instead. Now, grunts are very well for a certain animal whose native language, so to speak, is a grunt, only he spells it ‘grumph.’ He is a very good animal in his way, but we should never dream of asking him into our house or inviting him to sit down at our table. He and his grumphs would be quite out of place there. And so are your grunts, boys and girls. Leave them to the poor beast they belong to, and use your own language.

(2) I think that the second kind of pleasant words is the *kind kind*. If we could read Hebrew we should find that the word King Solomon used for ‘pleasant’ meant ‘love-breathing.’ That is just what kind words do—they breathe love: If you want to make friends with anybody, how do

you set about it? Do you snub them every time they speak to you? Do you take no interest in what they are doing, or throw cold water on all their plans? Of course not! You know better than that. You listen eagerly to what they have to say, and you try to be keen on what they are keen on. If they are in a difficulty you try to help them out of it; and if you can’t get them out of it you say how vexed you are, and that alone helps no end. If you want to have a friend and be a friend your words must be kind words. You have only to look around you to see that this is true. Look at the boy who prides himself on squashing other fellows! He’ll soon be left with nobody to squash. Look at the girl with the nippy tongue! She can nip away if she likes, but nobody will want to come within yards of her.

(3) The third kind of pleasant words we may call the *wholesome kind*. These are the words that are not only good to hear but help us to be better and do better. If you are feeling in despair about your work or anything else, and things are looking ‘blue,’ you know how tremendously it bucks you up if somebody gives you a word of praise. Why! you forget the blueness all in a minute. Instead of looking blue everything suddenly looks rose-coloured, and you go ahead double speed because of that little word of encouragement. There are people in this world who don’t require ‘a good talking-to’ to set them agoing. What they are needing is just a little pleasant word of praise.

Then you know what pleasant words do to a quarrel. Pleasant words and a quarrel simply can’t live in the same room. If you bring in pleasant words the quarrel immediately dies. It can’t help it. There’s something in a pleasant word that kills it outright.

Pleasant words are splendid for envy too. Envy is a nasty green feeling, but if you put a few pleasant words alongside it the greenness mysteriously fades away. The pleasant words act like magic, and hey presto! it is gone.

3. If we are going to require such a lot of pleasant words, where shall we manage to get them? We must have a store somewhere that we can go to when we need them. We must have more words than those that are on the tip of our tongue at the moment. That is common sense.

But we shan’t have much difficulty in solving the problem, for pleasant words don’t really belong

to the tip of our tongue at all. They belong by right to the heart. The tongue merely says them, but the heart means them. Now the heart is not only a storehouse, it is also a factory working day and night. The kind of goods it manufactures depends upon the one from whom it takes its orders. If it takes its orders from someone whom we all know, whose name begins with the fourth letter of the alphabet, then the thoughts and words and deeds which it manufactures will be hideous and cruel and wicked. But if it takes its orders from the King of kings, its thoughts and words and deeds will be lovely and loving, true and gentle, sweet and pleasant.

Boys and girls, let us see to it that we take our orders from Christ. Then we shall find it easy to be courteous, easy to be loving, easy to be helpful, easy to be generous, easy to speak pleasant words.

#### IV.

##### Stories for Any Day.

The title of the book is *Stories for Any Day*. It is published by the Pilgrim Press in Boston, U.S.A. The cost is one dollar net. The author of it is Carolyn Sherwin Bailey. This is how the stories began:

'There's nothing but the chimney of the Old Place left, Grandfather,' John said as they walked back from the orchard with their pockets full of apples.

'That's all,' Grandfather answered with a twinkle in his eyes.

'Why don't you tear down the old chimney, Grandfather?' John asked, 'now that you have the big new house. It's nothing but a pile of old bricks out here in the field.'

'I am keeping it because it tells me stories,' Grandfather said. 'Every time I go by it when the wind blows down through it, that old chimney has something interesting to say to me.'

'Oh!' said John, with his eyes very big now. 'Let's stop a minute by it, Grandfather, and see if it tells us a story.'

So they stopped in the field by the old chimney, and, suddenly, along came the wind, singing through the bricks.

*Whoo-oo-oo*, went the wind.

'What does it say, Grandfather?' asked John.

'It says that one fall, when I was only five years old, something wonderful happened. Your great-

grandmother went for a whole day's journey on the stage to sell some cloth she had spun and woven, and when she came back she brought me, what do you suppose?'

'Oh, I don't know. Please tell me,' begged John.

'A little red rocking-chair!' Grandfather said. 'And when it was cold and stormy, I sat and rocked and rocked in the little red rocking-chair in front of the chimney, and roasted apples and chestnuts, and read about Robinson Crusoe.'

'Oh, how nice!' John said.

Suddenly the wind sang again through the bricks of the old chimney.

*Whoo-oo-oo*, went the wind.

'What does it say now, Grandfather?' asked John.

'It says that once, a long, long time ago, when I was only six years old, there came a very cold, freezing storm quite early in the fall. We had a large, blazing fire of logs, and it roared and crackled in the chimney. We were at supper, but we heard a strange noise like someone crying. And it seemed to come down the chimney. Your great-grandfather went out in the rain with a lantern, and there on the roof was a little Indian boy. He was close to the chimney, trying to keep warm. He had strayed away from the reservation, and had climbed up the logs to the low roof where the chimney was. Your great-grandfather asked him to come down and see how warm the chimney was inside the house. He stayed with me all night, and his father, a big chief, followed his trail and took him home in the morning.'

'Oh, how exciting!' John said.

Then the wind sang again through the bricks of the old chimney.

*Whoo-oo-oo*, went the wind.

'Is it telling something now?' asked John.

'Oh, it is telling the best story of all now,' Grandfather said.

'Once, when it was fall, and I was seven years old, it was cold, early, and your great-grandfather and I wanted to build a fire in the fireplace. We brought in some pine knots and some hickory logs and laid the fire. Then your great-grandmother said that we must not light the fire. We could not understand why, and she would not tell us why. So we shivered, and wondered why we couldn't light a fire. Then, one morning, when the sun shone and it was warmer, we found out.'



'What was the reason?' John asked.

'Why,' said Grandfather, 'we found an empty swallows' nest lying on top of the wood in the fire-place. Your great-grandmother had a feeling that the swallows who nested in the chimney had not flown away yet; and she was right. When the empty nest blew down we knew that it was safe to light a fire whenever there was another cold night, because the swallows were safe.'

'Oh, I am so glad!' John said.

'And is that all about the old chimney?' he asked, as the wind rushed off to sing in the orchard.

'Oh no,' Grandfather said. 'I could tell you ever so many stories about what happened when that old chimney was new.'

'Oh, goody! And will you, Grandfather?' John asked.

'Of course I will,' Grandfather said.

And that is how the stories in this book began in the very first place.

## The Isolation of the Jew.

BY THE REV. R. L. MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D., SOMETIME ASSISTANT LECTURER IN HISTORY,  
QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

ALL thinking men are sooner or later struck by the marvellous phenomenon of the Jew. Divorced from territorial ties and scattered over the face of the earth, he still maintains in the midst of the world's peoples a separate and distinct existence; retaining the attributes, racial and cultural, which mark him as a man apart. This survival of nationality without country, of essential separation without segregation, is unique because of its successful persistence for almost two thousand years in the face of powerful factors making for absorption. According to all normal social tendencies the Jew should long since have disappeared, having become merged in the other peoples with whom he came in contact. But in accordance with all similar tendencies the successful maintenance of his separate and distinct isolation should have been impossible at the beginning of his existence as a nation. Accordingly his survival presents a unique historical problem.

I. At a very early stage in his history we can see already existent the spirit of a fierce exclusiveness. A pastoral tribe or tribes once lived the ordinary nomadic life of the Arabian desert. But swept forward in one of those migratory movements, caused by drought or climatic changes affecting pasture conditions, they moved westward; and finally a small confederacy of kindred tribes appears in the southernmost section of the Syrian coast. They called themselves 'Children of Israel,' but were known to their neighbours as 'Hebrews' or 'people from beyond.' And here in a goodly

land they gradually exchanged their nomadic life for an agricultural. At this point begins their real history, and at this point also begins their age-long effort to preserve and maintain their isolation. They differ from other Semitic immigrants in that there is implanted in them already the germ of monotheism in Yahweh-worship. And already there is a fierce element of fervour in that worship. It sets them apart from other tribes, and it renders possible their political and military union through an all-embracing bond of religious zeal. They are filled with the pride of an exclusive cult. They feel themselves separate for ever from 'the heathen.' And much of their subsequent history is merely the record of their efforts to keep entire that isolation.

The real history of a people begins for us when from any cause the nomad pastoral life is exchanged for life under conditions which, by making existence more difficult, call forth new activities on the part of man. Life in the former stage is fixed and regulated by most rigid custom. Innovators are suppressed, because the problem of living under pastoral conditions has been satisfactorily solved. There is an equilibrium in the struggle between Nature and Man. Consequently there is no history worthy of the name. A Bedouin tribe may exist for centuries and yet furnish the student with little or nothing to record in the way of human achievement. But when a pastoral tribe is expelled by climatic or other change from its grass lands and compelled to settle in some definite

tract of country, the new conditions that confront them require a new adjustment on their part, and the adoption of a new mode of existence. The unfamiliar aspect of the struggle with nature demands effort and invention. Life has become more complex. Work is differentiated, and civilization is the consequence.

Now this was the stage that had been reached by the Israelites. They had arrived at the Land of Promise. But it demanded toil and energetic labour as conditions of yielding its fruits. The simple needs of the pastoral life could no longer be satisfied by the old methods. Frost and wind and rain entered into the arena against the struggling settler. He held his sword-won land by might. The simple nomadic life was over and done, and the 'son of Israel' was face to face now with a new set of conditions and a new sphere of existence. He was brought into contact with a world which had developed a civilization unknown to his fathers, and of which he was instinctively suspicious and distrustful. Yet it was ever present to him in countless ways. For along the highway to Egypt the Midian trader marched. Syrians went up to Damascus. Phœnicians from the coast cities hawked their merchandise amongst the villages and opened up before his eyes a new world.

Now here, on the verge of a new era in their history, the fierce exclusiveness, the sense of separation already present in their national consciousness, determined their path. Deliberately they set themselves to maintain their isolation. They sacrificed to this ideal the hope of earthly gain which might have been theirs had they adopted the customs and learnt the ways of their mighty neighbours. And history is now confronted with the spectacle of a desert-bred people attempting, in surroundings purely agricultural and permanent, to maintain their traditional customs and pastoral exclusiveness. Worldly advance did not lie along these lines. Comfort and gain could best be assured by the fullest intercourse with their neighbours, by the adoption of their ways of life, by seeking in every way to adapt themselves to their new environment. But this they believed could be done only at the cost of ultimate absorption into these surrounding peoples, and they deemed the price too high. The record of their race is one long struggle, a series of attempts to preserve their national isolation by various expedients. All the old customs could not be retained. Physical

reasons compelled them to dig and build. But at least once a year during the Feast of Tabernacles they would return to the ancient life, and for seven days they lived in tents again. In the case of other old-time customs there was compromise where only compromise was possible. But their general attitude towards their new environment was one of pugnacious defiance.

The strictest ordinances were laid down as to intercourse with 'the heathen.' Marriage was confined to members of the Yahweh-communion. The works of the heathen were condemned seriatim, and abstention from them enforced by the penalties of a priestly ruling class. These prohibitions extended into the closest details of social life. The very beard of the Israelite must not conform to the heathen pattern. Their isolation was emphasized by the clothes they wore. And the idea of 'a separate people' grew more and more intense, as in the course of generation after generation its buttresses were strengthened by the forces of heredity and the sanctions of religion. Now and then sections developed a tendency towards some relaxation of the close restrictions. But the heart of the people remained substantially true to them. And there were always to be found some who believed that the nation had already gone too far in adaptation to their new environment, who advocated a more complete return to the older institutions as most favourable to a loyal service of Yahweh. The Nazarites forbade the use of wine because the wine was the symbol of Canaan's culture and civilization, and was also connected with the worship of the Nature gods. They jealously preserved an old Arabian tradition in the prohibition of interference with the hair. Others too saw in the new civilization dangers that gravely threatened the simplicity of Israel's life and the efficient maintenance of her national religion. The Rechabites represented the zealots of isolation, and Jehonadab headed a reactionary movement. The principles which governed his policy can be seen from the rules adopted by his descendants. They refused wine from its association with the worship of the local Baals. But they went still further, and by refusing to build houses or sow seeds or plant vineyards, they proclaimed their faith that through the transition from a pastoral and nomadic life to that of an agricultural people the children of Israel had been guilty of apostasy. The elements of the new civilization which in spite



of all effort had inevitably crept in through the stern requirements of physical needs, they held to be responsible for a forsaking of Yahweh as their ancestral God. Thus through all the years the creed of isolation in all its completeness never lacked a witness. And more than one of the prophets held strenuously, that the early uncomplicated period of the nation's life, before ever it came into contact with the heathen ways, was preferable to all later developments that it may have made. But such a political and social isolation as they sought to maintain could not exist for ever. The webs of Egypt and Assyria were spread too wide to allow the sons of Israel to escape enmeshment, and so in the progress of the centuries their great day came to an end. The period of the Exile followed upon participation in the world-politics of their time. Under Nehemiah the Jewish State was reconstructed, but on lines that transformed it into the Jewish Church. Attempts were made to establish again their national independence. The Standard of Israel was set up under the Maccabees, and the old intense religious fervour stirred the people as it had in the days when, welded together by their common worship of Yahweh, they had fallen upon the Canaanites. But soon again the Standard fell. It was raised once more against Titus, but, broken and torn, it was captured by the Roman legions, and the Temple service ceased for ever. Then for the last time, in A.D. 132, Bar Cochba lifted aloft the flag of Zion. But the stubborn revolt was stamped out. Hadrian founded a Roman colony on the site of old Jerusalem. The Jew was banished from his well-loved city, and where Yahweh's Temple once stood Jupiter was worshipped with all the pomp of Imperial Rome.

Thus ends their history as an independent nation, a history which stretches back to the days when, on exchanging a pastoral for an agricultural life, the sons of Israel set before them the ideal of isolation. The last attempt to revive their national existence had failed, and they were once again wandering and landless men. But the centuries had done their work. The national policy had borne its fruit. The years have gone by and empires have risen and fallen, and far and wide the Jew is scattered amongst the nations of the earth. Yet still, in the face of all persecution and dispersion, he has successfully maintained his racial characteristics. Without territory or government

he has preserved his national attributes. In continual contact with all the civilization of to-day he keeps intact an essential isolation.

2. Because of this he stands for a unique historical phenomenon. By all the laws of analogy he should have been absorbed. In fact he should scarcely have attained a separate national existence. Contact with the 'heathen' civilization that confronted him when he exchanged the simple pastoral life of the steppe for an agricultural existence should have resulted in ultimate union with his more powerful neighbours. For sentiments inherited from fiercely exclusive nomadic ancestors were too weak of themselves to furnish an enduring basis for the maintenance of national isolation.

In what, then, was this strangely enduring sense of separation ultimately rooted? The whole study of their history points decisively to one ultimate source, the worship of Yahweh as their God. Against all that made for dissolution the common bond of the Yahweh-cult held strong. Hereditary exclusiveness, however insufficient in itself, was no negligible ally. Their law, secular and sacred, was made one law in its support. Prophet and priest on this point united in continually proclaiming the message of fundamental separation from all others through the Yahweh-bond. Thus the idea of isolation, an idea rooted in a sense of religious superiority, reinforced by inherited racial traits, and buttressed by the strongest possible ecclesiastical and civil sanctions, grew more and more intense as generation succeeded generation, until at last it reached a strength that has enabled it to survive the passing of territory and government, and to keep the Jew a man for ever apart.

The essential germ, then, of that national consciousness which grew up and maintained itself so stubbornly in the face of all environment is to be found in the Yahweh-cult. Apart from this, the other historical factors tending to maintain such a sense of national isolation would have proved too weak when confronted with the factors making for absorption. So that in dealing with the unique rise of Israel we are driven back ultimately to that irreducible factor in their history which seems to defy analysis, the element which differentiated the Yahweh-cult from all other cults of its time. For in this is to be found the root of Israel's unique growth, the source of her strange history, the ultimate secret of her proud position as the spiritual

mother of us all. By it the sons of Israel were separated from all others and were ever conscious of such separation. And because of it the religion of Israel developed along lines that are unique.

3. Speculation as to the exact nature of this factor is peculiarly difficult owing to the lack of contemporary testimony regarding the early conception of God, and to the somewhat conflicting nature of such evidence as exists. Accounts written many centuries later than the events they chronicle are necessarily coloured by the later ideas. And so definite detailed knowledge as to the conception of God prevalent in pre-Mosaic Israel is perhaps destined to remain absent, or at the best, to be vague and incomplete. But from the evidence to be gathered from survivals of ancient customs, there is much to identify in substance the patriarchal conception with that of primitive Semitic religion as furnishing the historical starting-point for the religion of Israel. Nevertheless, the later religion of Israel is not a natural evolution from the Semitic mind. It developed from the first on lines that are peculiarly its own and presents features very different from those possessed by the religion of the nomadic Semites.

These features which differentiated it from this last were communicated by a remarkable succession of individuals in whose consciousness arose the conviction of a special revelation from Yahweh. The content of this revelation they taught to their fellows with all the fervour and enthusiasm which spring from the assurance that a mandate and a message have been given by the Divine. And it is through these teachers that the bridge was built across the great gulf which is fixed between the primitive Semitic conceptions of God and the profoundly spiritual views of Him set forth by the later Hebrew prophets.

This individual consciousness of a Divine revelation is incapable of analysis, but it was undoubtedly through a number of persons in whom it arose that the trend of Israel's religion was determined. For there was no other way. The Word must always become flesh before it can come home in all its fulness to the hearts of men. And because these personal revelations that came to certain individuals defy all adequate natural explanation, the remarkable development of Israel's religion cannot be accounted for on naturalistic principles. The prophet cannot be regarded as the mere

representative of his age and people. For there is that in the record of the Jews which cannot be explained simply in terms of historic continuity.

Now this remarkable succession of individuals who gave to the religion of Israel its unique characteristics must have had a beginning. And to the first of such individuals is due the first step towards the later monotheism. But to determine with positive certainty the identity of that first man who implanted in primitive Semitic religion the germ that caused the religion of Israel to develop along lines that are unique is impossible, through the lack of sufficient evidence. Abraham has been selected by some, but direct confirmation of Abraham's historical existence is absent as yet. But of this at least we are sure, that the most important link, if not the first, at the beginning of the chain was Moses, the founder of the nation.

Two most striking examples of the state-building power of religion are to be found in history. In the seventh century A.D. a religious doctrine was preached amongst the Arab tribes, and these people, up till then scattered and weak, immediately took the form of a powerful State. Before a hundred years had passed they had founded cities and overthrown empires, and, united by the bond of a common religion, the Federated State of Islam covered a considerable section of the globe. But thousands of years before, amongst tribes that were akin, Moses had in like manner created a State. For to his leadership is undoubtedly due the union of the whole body of Israelites in the Yahweh-cult. He brought them into a definite relationship to Yahweh. He made them realize that in an indissoluble fashion Yahweh was their God, and that they were Yahweh's people. And in his teaching is probably to be found the first great impetus of that driving force which henceforth differentiated the religion of Israel from that of other Semitic tribes, and bound them into a homogeneous people capable of resisting absorption. Then this initial impetus was strengthened and guided in succeeding years by other similar teachers conscious also of a special knowledge of God. And so the evolution went on, until at last the Yahweh-cult alone of all others reached the purely spiritual monotheism of Isaiah, and paved the way for that still fuller revelation which came through Jesus Christ. But all through their varied history it was the conscious-



ness of this unique revelation that kept them apart from the rest of mankind. It was this conviction ever growing stronger through generation after generation that stamped upon their souls indelibly that ideal of national isolation which to this day

has successfully prevented their fusion with any other race. Above all else the Jew was Yahweh's man, and as such he has remained always apart, conscious of his separateness through the bond of covenant relationship with his God.

## Contributions and Comments.

### St. Paul's Teaching as to the Rewards of Liberality.

WHAT does the Apostle teach in 2 Co 9<sup>6-11</sup> as to God's rewards for men who give in generous fashion? Does he mean that such men will have more abundant material prosperity and thus be enabled more than ever to show the spirit of liberality? That is the view taken by H. W. Meyer. To interpret the *πᾶσα χάρις* in v.<sup>8</sup> as if it meant spiritual good is, he says, to be 'at variance with the context.' Rather, 'it refers to *earthly* blessings by which we have the means for beneficence.' Dr. Alexander Maclaren takes the same view. 'Paul,' he says, 'has no hesitation in asserting that God rewards giving by larger possessions of the same sort as our gifts.' 'Conspicuous instances prove that, even from a business point of view, there is no better investment than "lending to the Lord" by "giving to the poor." But if this is the correct interpretation, it must be confessed that the appeal is not of a lofty order, and that constitutes a grave *à priori* objection to it. One hesitates before affirming that such a man as St. Paul would use an argument of this kind. Moreover, there is the obvious objection that in large numbers of cases generous-hearted people do not prosper in mundane things. We may truly say of liberality that:

'Oft 'tis sooner found  
In lowly sheds with smoky rafters  
Than in tapestry halls' and courts of princes.'

For the generosity of the poor to the poor is proverbial, yet such people often remain poor all their days. Doubtless, the saying in the Proverbs is true, and the Lord will repay the man who hath pity upon the poor; but we cannot affirm that the loan will be paid back in hard cash with interest. St. Paul's assertion, says Dr. Maclaren, 'is absolutely true in a higher fashion. . . . God

enriches the liberal soul with treasures above all worldly wealth.' But this tells strongly in favour of a more spiritual interpretation, for, if the passage be understood otherwise, the Apostle's statement is not 'absolutely true' and it is difficult to believe that he would have committed himself to such an incorrect assertion.

Some support for Meyer's view might be found in the word *ἀντάρκεια* in v.<sup>8</sup>. He will not have it that that word means anything but an 'inward self-sufficiency,' and that, of course, is the force of *ἀντάρκεις* in Ph 4<sup>11</sup> and Ecclus 40<sup>18</sup>. But Moulton and Milligan's citations in their *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* prove that the noun was used in the sense of 'a competence.' It must therefore be acknowledged that it does look as though the Apostle in v.<sup>8</sup> were assuring his readers that the generous man would not lack worldly sufficiency. But, as against this, we have to bear in mind the breadth of the statement in vv.<sup>8</sup> and <sup>11</sup>. 'God is able to make *all* grace abound unto you, that ye having always *all* sufficiency in *everything* may abound unto *every* good work . . . ye being enriched in *everything* unto all liberality.' When one calls to mind the N.T. conception of wealth and recollects this Apostle's idea of himself as being 'poor yet making many rich,' it is not easy to read his words otherwise than as meaning that God rewards the generous giver with the highest and most varied 'competence' to bless his fellows.

Again, what is the force of the O.T. citation in v.<sup>9</sup>, 'His righteousness endureth for ever'? Dr. James Denney says that here as in Ps 112 the point is that 'the expression reflects God's verdict on the character as a whole.' But if so, the quotation is not apt for it was obviously meant to illustrate and confirm the statement in v.<sup>8</sup>. Surely, the context obliges us to understand it as meaning that the man who is marked by thoughtful and glad liberality will have enduring high character as his reward. What he does reacts on his nature. He

will grow in unselfishness. His used talents will multiply. He will become more and more a useful servant of God and man in many ways. Habit will confirm and strengthen righteousness in him. This interpretation has at least the merit of giving appositeness to the Apostle's quotation and, if it be correct, it confirms the view which we have taken as to the meaning of v.<sup>8</sup>.

In the verses which follow it is plain that the writer is making appeal to the loftiest motives. Deep thankfulness to God, he says, will be stirred in the hearts of Jewish saints by the gifts of the Corinthians, and their generous love will destroy all prejudice against Gentile converts, making a grand new union of hearts. That is the harvest which the Apostle encourages his friends to expect. They will have the great joy of being spiritual benefactors.

I submit that the whole appeal is of the same lofty character. Its teaching throughout is that God rewards the liberal man with the highest riches, making him increasingly competent to bless his fellows.

HENRY J. WICKS.

Loughton, Essex.

### Faith's Function in St. Jude's Epistle.

TWICE in his brief letter St. Jude speaks of faith. In v.<sup>8</sup> he says that he was compelled to write to encourage his readers *ἐπαγωνίεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείᾳ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*. At v.<sup>20</sup> he bids them keep themselves in the love of God *ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγνωστῇ ὑμῶν πίστει*. In this latter place 'their most holy faith' is clearly the foundation of the Christian character or of the life of the Christian society. In the former place 'the faith once delivered to the saints' would seem to be regarded as the spring of Christian endeavour, the inauguration and outset of the Christian conflict.

For *ἐπαγωνίεσθαι* is a word borrowed from athletics, meaning 'to contend in the "event" which follows on,' and (probably) more freely 'to engage in a fresh round or heat.' Transferred to other fields we find it used of following a *previous speaker* in a lawsuit, or a *competitor* in a contest of rhetoric; of following up an *enemy* met in former conflicts, of a commander following up his own *victories*; of our Lord endorsing and driving home the *rebukes* addressed by John Baptist to

Scribes and Pharisees; of pursuing a *theme*, elaborating a *statement* by the use of several equivalent expressions, prolonging an *effort*, further pursuing a *strife*.

So when St. Jude calls on Christians *ἐπαγωνίεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείᾳ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*, he bids them *follow up* 'the victory that overcame the world' by the conflict with evil which was inaugurated by the great *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως* and taken up by those who received from Him the Holy Spirit.

The verb *ἐπαγωνίεσθαι* occurs nowhere else in the Greek Bible. The Vulgate coins a deponent to represent it—*supercertari semel traditae fidei*.

G. H. WHITAKER.

Woughton Rectory, Bletchley.

### 'The Sure Mercies of David.'

THIS striking expression of the 2 Isaiah (Is 55<sup>3</sup>) no reader will miss, even in the E.VV.; and so far, no explanation has been offered—within the writer's knowledge—without also admitting a possible, if not probable, objection of one kind or another. Usually the explanations follow the historical line, whether in prose or in poetry, as the case may be, and sometimes, if not always, end with the ideal; and they all ignore the ambiguity of the grammatical construction. The elementary student, on first reading, would not miss that ambiguity. The mercies, or lovingkindnesses, of David might be taken in either sense, namely, those shown to David, or those shown or sung of by David. He would also ask whether the name David be used in a personal sense or otherwise. But our master commentators have taken no notice of this elementary ambiguity. Without a note they have assumed the former: Isaiah could only have meant the lovingkindness shown to a David, whether historical or ideal. Hence ample room is left for everything that could be said of the lovingkindnesses sung of, by, to, or in a 'David.'

A tentative note may be offered along the line forgotten by the critics, namely, the lovingkindnesses sung of, *by* or *to* a David, whether historical or ideal; which songs may have won fame, been known to 2 Isaiah and his circle, and perhaps formed a collection of some size or other. These points leave ample material for the thorough reader. At present it is but necessary to recall the fact that



the commentators have completely forgotten this last point. Maybe that criticism has only been able so far to suggest a date for the first temple collection of psalms (Pss 3-41); and that date falls as late as Nehemiah's time (444-431 B.C.). But the collection presupposes that the psalms which formed it were of earlier date, whether meant or not for temple use. If any of them bore the fame of antiquity, they might well have been pre-exilic. That is a point of detail. I would only assert that fond religious songs of the past, dedicated to a noble patron, were known to 2 Isaiah and his fellows in the Exile, in which the mercies or lovingkindnesses of God were freely celebrated. Just as the 2 Isaiah added the adjective *eternal* to the covenant, so he added the adjective *unfailing* to the mercies—a true mark of the high religious value which he attached to psalmody as a means of grace.

That note clearly shows a possible and succinct meaning of the phrase to the devout students of the Exile. The next step would be to show that it would fit in with the context. The mention of David led the author to add his own note on the value of that person, historical or ideal; and here one would first follow the prophet's idealism. The historical exponents all come to the ideal, and some of them begin and end with the latter; the crux for them is to show that the 2 Isaiah followed the historical ideal, rather than had an ideal of his own. The present point is that the 2 Isaiah had his own way of reading the idea which he attached to the name of a David famed for its connexion with the praises of Israel. He left alone all thoughts of a royal personage. He would educe the thought attached to the patron of their praises. This he expresses in v.<sup>4</sup>: the patron of their songs was set for a witness of the peoples, a leader and commander of the peoples—predicates which involve no royal attribute, no kingly state, but which mean the moral and religious force of the activity of such an ideal in the midst of the nations.

We observe in v.<sup>4</sup>: (1) the absence of מלך, whether as substantive or predicate; (2) the prime position of 'witness'; and (3) the subsidiary or explicative position of 'leader' and 'commander.' The David mentioned stood clear of all thoughts of royalty: he was the patron of 'songs and praises.' Hence his prime value was that of a witness (עֵד, μαρτύριον), one who emphatically

reiterated his religious affirmations (cf. BDB, s.v.), the evidence uttered by the mouth (Dt 17<sup>6</sup> 19<sup>5</sup>), here in songs to be sung by all (cf. Dt. 31<sup>19, 21</sup> J). He was a *faithful* witness (cf. עֵד אֱמֻנִים, Pr. 14<sup>5</sup>; עֵד אֱמֶת, Jer 42<sup>5</sup>), and a witness to the unfailing mercies so celebrated in their stock of praises. The *witness* characteristic stood first and foremost in the story of God's mercies as sung from their psalms. Any David of a poet, who took up that part, would soon prove himself to be a master of spiritual power in the community and to the world outside, i.e. a 'leader and a commander of the people,' two terms which are free from any necessary royal qualification.

We need not analyse and estimate the translations of נָגִיד in the E.VV. The A.V. here goes nearest to its simple and original meaning—'the one to the fore' (נָגִיד); so the LXX renders it ἡγουμένος (28 times)—'the one who takes the lead.' In itself it has no association with any official duty as such. It might be natural and true enough to describe different officials as leaders in their departments. A few times the word is used to describe David or Solomon as *rulers* (R.V. 'princes') over the people (1 S 25<sup>80</sup>, 2 S 6<sup>21</sup> 7<sup>8</sup>, 1 K 1<sup>35</sup>); but it is used oftener to describe other officers, not royal. As they were to take the lead in their departments, so the poet took the lead in his, and proved himself a leader indeed. His leadership would take the form of a moral command (מִצְוָה)—not the injunction of an official (cf. Gn 27<sup>8</sup>, a mother's instruction; Nu 32<sup>25</sup>, Moses' instruction); or at least, the loud cry or shout of an earnest singer (cf. 42<sup>11</sup>), whose very earnestness forced him to utter it with all his energy so as to command the attention of all men, no matter of what nationality. Such would be the natural effect of the chanted psalms, as coming from all the earnest servants of God, upon all peoples without distinction.

Here, then, is a link which leads up to the next verse with its wonderful mission conception. The author knows that it will be wonderful—'Behold.' The servants will prove themselves a band of missionaries to all peoples. Not that they leave their homes for foreign lands, but that foreigners will be attracted to them. With their psalms, and perhaps especially the ringing joy of their services, they would follow a David, bear witness to their God before all peoples, make a true impression

upon even foreigners, lead and win and *call* a nation as yet unknown in a religious sense. The subject of their witness would be the *lovingkindness* of God—the unfailing ones, as sung of, in Davidic psalms. Surely this explanation is not too modern for a 2 Isaiah!

My object has been to call attention to the fact (1) that our commentators have ignored the ambiguity of this expression in a grammatical sense; and (2) that the meaning, which they have missed, gives us a truly Biblical view—the only view that fits into the words of a prophet who had nothing to say about the Kingdom-messianic thought of other prophets.

WILLIAM GLYNNE.

St. Andrew's, Bishop Auckland.

### ‘Little Ones.’

WHAT is the normal meaning of the word *תַּף*, *taf*, which occurs 42 times in the Old Testament? In the English versions it is rendered *little ones*, *little children*, *children*, except in Gn 47<sup>12</sup>, where they have *families*. This is supported by the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon (with a qualification in the Addenda), the Vulgate (*parvuli*), Kautzsch's German Bible (*kleine Kinder*), and all commentaries and translations to which I have been able to refer, with the exception of one translation and one commentary.

The one translation is the very notable one of the Septuagint; and the one commentary is that by Dr. Payne Smith on *Genesis* in Bishop Ellicott's ‘Old Testament Commentary for English Readers’; see on Gn 34<sup>29</sup> 17<sup>13</sup>. According to Dr. Payne Smith, the meaning is *the whole body of dependents, men, women, and children*. With this the LXX is in accord. It renders the word in no less than twelve different ways. Its most common rendering is *ἀποσκευή* (=household), which occurs 12 times. Three other renderings, *ἀπαρτία*, *οἰκία*, and *πανοικία*, mean the same thing; and four more, *συνγένεια* (kin or clan), *λαος*, *ὄχλος*, and *σῶμα* (slaves) give the same general sense. In fourteen passages it has either *τέκνον*, *παιδίον*, or *νήπιος*, which correspond to ‘little ones.’

An examination of the usage of the word shows that it is employed principally in three connexions:—

First, and chiefly, with reference to warfare, to denote the *non-combatants*—those who would be left behind when the army went on an expedition, and who, being immobile, were liable to be retained as hostages or, in the event of defeat, to form part

of the spoil of the conqueror (Gn 34<sup>29</sup>, Nu 31<sup>9</sup>). For example, when Joseph went up out of Egypt with a very great host to bury his father in Canaan, all his brothers accompanied him, but they left their *taf* behind with the flocks and herds (Gn 50<sup>8</sup>). Pharaoh at first would not let the Israelites leave Egypt unless they left their *taf* behind as hostages (Ex 10<sup>10, 24</sup>). The two and a half tribes built cities for their *taf* and left them in charge of the flocks and herds when they went to assist in the conquest of Western Palestine. ‘Little ones’ would scarcely be left in charge of cities with flocks and herds.

Secondly, it is used, with reference to the need of sustenance, to denote the number of *mouths that had to be fed*. In the famine, Joseph nourished his father and brothers and all his father's house ‘according to [the number of persons in] their *tafs*,’ Gn 47<sup>12, 24</sup>; cf. 43<sup>8</sup> 50<sup>21</sup>. Judah pleaded that he might take Benjamin to Egypt lest not only they themselves but their *tafs* (all their dependents) should die of starvation.

Thirdly, it is used to denote *all the members of a community other than the head* (or the master and mistress). When the object of a journey was not a military expedition but a permanent migration, all the *taf* went. Jacob went down into Egypt with all his *taf* (Gn 46<sup>5</sup>). The Israelites left Egypt with all their *taf* (Ex 12<sup>37</sup>). When the Danites migrated to a new settlement, they took their *taf* with them (Jg 18<sup>21</sup>).

In the above passages, and others like them, the word is evidently used, as in the LXX renderings, to denote the dependent members of a household or community; *i.e.* the women, children, and servants or slaves. If the derivation of the word is from *תַּף*, ‘to take quick, tripping steps,’ this may be from the pitter-patter of a mixed crowd quite as well as from that of children's feet.

It requires, however, to be stated that, in quite half the number of cases, the wives are mentioned separately (Gn 34<sup>29</sup>, Nu 32<sup>26</sup>, Dt 2<sup>84</sup> 3<sup>6, 19</sup> 20<sup>14</sup> 29<sup>11(10)</sup> 31<sup>12</sup>, Jos 14<sup>835</sup>, Jg 21<sup>10</sup>, Est 3<sup>13</sup> 8<sup>11</sup>, Jer 40<sup>7</sup> 41<sup>16</sup> 43<sup>6</sup>, Ezk 9<sup>6</sup>). It is this that probably led to the rendering ‘little ones.’ But probably, even in these passages, servants are meant to be included as well as children. In nearly as many other cases, however, the women are not separately mentioned (Gn 43<sup>8</sup> 47<sup>24</sup> 50<sup>8, 21</sup>, Ex 10<sup>10, 24</sup> 12<sup>37</sup>, Nu 32<sup>16, 17, 24</sup>, Jg 18<sup>21</sup>, 2 S 15<sup>22</sup>, Ezr 8<sup>21</sup>). In 2 Ch 20<sup>18</sup> 31<sup>18</sup>, as Dr. Payne Smith points out, the children are spoken of separately from the *taf*. It would appear also from Nu 31<sup>17, 18</sup> that the *taf* was sometimes considered as twofold—the *taf* of men and the *taf* of women—a very natural division in an Oriental country, where even in the home the sexes keep apart.

EDWARD P. RICE.

Hassocks.



## Entre Nous.

### FRANCIS THOMPSON'S POETRY.

#### I.

#### The Poet.

IN his poems Francis Thompson is at first but a shadow. Gradually, as you read, the shadow reveals itself as flesh and blood, a human being who keeps company with you till the end. And the manhood is worshipful; you feel that its true realm is the spiritual world. 'The world knew him not,' has been the thought of many minds.

Francis Thompson died of consumption in November 1907, and was immediately talked of as a wonder, for the intensely sad story of his life had begun to be whispered abroad. Now the proverbial 'nine days' have passed, and he is taken on his merits. Sober judgment but confirms the idea of his being not only one of the greatest of poets, but a man of deeply religious spirit.

He was not a voluminous writer, although in his early London days he scribbled on every available piece of paper: even the discarded account books of Mr. M'Master, his first rescuer, were covered with poetry, and prose. Two moderate-sized volumes of poetry and another of prose papers represent his works.

With the former we would specially deal as more directly revealing Thompson, the man. These poems are so erudite, and at the same time so artistic, that one is filled with amazement at the thought of the author being for a long period almost entirely without books. 'I had no books by me save Æschylus and Blake,' he said in answer to Mr. Wilfrid Meynell's 'You must have had access to many books when you wrote that essay'—'Paganism Old and New,' the first of his work accepted by the editor of *Merry England*.

Where then, or how, did Francis Thompson learn the music of words?—for his song is certainly not of the unpremeditated order. How did he get his mind stored with classic lore to such an extent that the ordinary reader often feels himself unequal to the task of following him? For answer we must go back to the poet's childhood in the house of his father, Dr. Thompson of Preston, and later of Ashton-under-Lyne. One cannot help feeling sorry for the little fellow of Mr. Everard Meynell's biography, who understood girls better than boys,

and who never knew 'the technique of being a boy.' His playmates were his sisters; they had common playthings; Frank was even fascinated with their dolls. He made stories about them. 'I dramatized them,' he said long afterwards; 'I fell in love with them; I did not father them; intolerance is justified of her children.' In a sense, it was a lonely childhood, for his father's house was a home of silence and reserve. Reserve early became almost a second nature with Frank. The verses in 'The Fallen Yew' are reminiscent of those far-off days:

Its breast was hallowed as the tooth of eld;  
And boys, there creeping unbeheld,  
A laughing moment dwelled.

Yet they, within its very heart so crept,  
Reached not the heart that courage kept  
With winds and years beswept.

And in its boughs did close and kindly nest  
The birds, as they within its breast,  
By all its leaves caressed.

But bird nor child might touch by any art  
Each other's or the tree's hid heart,  
● A whole God's breadth apart;

The breadth of God, the breadth of death and life!  
Even so, even so, in undreamed strife  
With pulseless Law, the wife,—

The sweetest wife on sweetest marriage-day,—  
Their souls at grapple in mid-way,  
Sweet to her sweet may say:

'I take you to my inmost heart, my true!'  
Ah, fool! but there is one heart you  
Shall never take him to!

The hold that falls not when the town is got,  
The heart's heart, whose immured plot  
Hath keys yourself keep not!<sup>1</sup>

But he was happy. The religion of his home meant a great deal; he felt he had a personal share in it. 'Know you not what it is to be a child?' he asks in the famous essay on Shelley. 'It is to have a spirit yet streaming from the waters of baptism; it is to believe in love, to believe in loveliness, to believe in belief; it is to be so little that the elves can reach to whisper in your ear; it is to turn pumpkins into coaches, and mice into horses, lowness into loftiness, and nothing into everything, for each child has its fairy godmother

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Francis Thompson*, i. 182.



in its own soul; it is to live in a nutshell and to count yourself the king of infinite space; it is

To see a world in a grain of sand,  
And a heaven in a wild flower,  
Hold infinity in the palm of your hand,  
And eternity in an hour;

it is to know not as yet that you are under sentence of life, nor petition that it be commuted into death. When we become conscious in dreaming that we dream, the dream is on the point of breaking; when we become conscious in living that we live, the ill dream is but just beginning.<sup>1</sup>

The boy became a dreamer of dreams. A housemaid remembers him on the top of the ladder in the book-cupboard, oblivious to her call to meals; he was making friends with the poets. Referring to those days he says, 'I read Shakespeare, Scott, the two chief poems of Coleridge, and the ballads of Macaulay.' We have his own word for it too that he tried to read Shakespeare for the benefit of his sisters and the servants; but both 'kicked against Julius Cæsar as dry—though they diplomatically refrained from saying so.' If he was then too young to have quite awakened to the poetry of words, 'the beauty of language, the sense of magic in diction, of words suddenly becoming a marvel, and quick with a preternatural life,' those days came later, doubtless at Ushaw Catholic College, to which his father sent him in the hope that he would one day become a priest.

There he was described as 'a timid, shrinking little boy.' He earned no distinction in his classes although he performed his prescribed tasks with more than average success. But there was a certain indolence about him which made itself noticeable, due, one can believe, to the languor that is often a characteristic of the phthisical temperament. It is pathetic beyond speech to read that in the trembling hand of the last months 'he wrote out in big capitals on pages torn from exercise books such texts as were calculated to frighten him into his clothes. "Thou wilt not lie a-bed when the last trump blows"; "Thy sleep with the worms will be long enough," and so on. They were ineffectual. His was a long series of broken trysts—trysts with the sunrise, trysts with Sunday mass, obligatory but impossible; trysts with friends.'<sup>2</sup>

After seven years he returned home from Ushaw,

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Francis Thompson*, iii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> E. Meynell, *The Life of Francis Thompson*, 32.

a disappointment to his parents. Wisely gauging the situation, the President wrote to his father that owing to Frank's increasing nervous timidity he felt compelled to concur in the opinion of his director and others that 'it is not the holy will of God that he should go on for the priesthood.' At the same time he recognized Frank's ability, an ability which, but for a certain indolence, would, he felt sure, bring him success in any career. Yet in his walks at Ushaw he saw the sunsets which suggested his 'Ode to the Setting Sun,' and at the sight of a daisy 'all his paths would be strewn with white and gold.' Above all he loved Ushaw's Chapel. *A.M.D.G.*—'To the Greater Glory of God'—was already his pen's motto. It was inscribed on his exercise books, and meant, we believe, an honest dedication.

Next he tried Owens' College, Manchester, and the study of medicine. But the years he spent there certainly did not go to the making of a doctor, for he hated the work. The Manchester years, in fact, make a story of failure and increasing loneliness, for a habit of silence and reserve continued to grow upon him. He did not work; but he read poetry in the public library, and often visited the picture galleries. There he trained for an actor in unreal realities. Long afterwards, he recalled a statue 'which thrilled my youth in a passion such as feminine mortality was skill-less to instigate. . . . Thither each evening, as twilight fell, I stole to meditate and worship the baffling mysteries of her meaning: as twilight fell, and the blank noon surceased arrest upon her life, and in the vagueness countenance the eyes broke out from their day-long ambushade. Eyes of violet blue, drowsed-amorous, which surveyed me not, but looked ever beyond, where a spell enfixed them,

Waiting for something, not for me.

And I was content. Content; for by such tenure of unnoticedness I knew that I held my privilege to worship: had she beheld me, she would have denied, have condemned my gaze. Between us, now, are years and tears; but the years waste her not, and the tears wet her not; neither misses she me or any man. There, I think, she is standing yet; there, I think, she will stand for ever: the divinity of an accident, awaiting a divine thing impossible, which can never come to her, and she knows this not. For I reject the vain fable that the ambrosial creature is really an unspiritual



compound of lime, which the gross ignorant call plaster of Paris. If Paris indeed had to do with her, it was he of Ida. And for him, perchance, she waits.<sup>1</sup>

Constitutionally he was phthisical, and borne down by an abnormal languor; his disinclination to do ordinary work grew stronger and stronger, his world was a world of dreams. After an illness during his medical course, de Quincey's *Confessions of an Opium Eater* was put into his hands by his mother. It was her last present to him, for she died soon afterwards. Making the acquaintance of de Quincey through his *Confessions*, Francis Thompson fell under his spell. Love and admiration for the writer led him to taste the drug, and once beginning he had to 'dree his weird.' The case is presented in all fairness by his sympathetic biographer. 'Opium,' he says, 'stayed off the assaults of tuberculosis; it gave him the wavering strength that made life just possible for him, whether on the streets or through all those other distresses and discomforts that it was his character deeply to resent but not to remove by any normal courses; if it could threaten physical degradation he was able by conquest to tower in moral and mental glory. On the other hand, it dealt with him remorselessly as it dealt with Coleridge and all its consumers. It put him in such constant strife with his own conscience that he had ever to hide himself from himself, and for concealment he fled to that which made him ashamed, until it was as if the fig-leaf were of necessity plucked from the Tree of the Fall. It killed in him the capacity for acknowledging those duties to his family and friends which, had his heart not been in shackles, he would have owned with no ordinary ardour.'<sup>2</sup>

The one self in him saw and realized the beauty of a life in communion with God, and continually sought after it; the other was like a prisoner bound by chains, powerless to free himself. If under normal constitutional conditions St. Augustine speaks of the truly spiritual life as hard to attain to because of his divided self, what must it have been in the case of Francis Thompson? 'The thoughts wherein I meditated on Thee,' says St. Augustine in his *Confessions*, 'were like the efforts of such as would awake, who yet overcome with a heavy drowsiness, are again drenched therein. Nor had I anything to answer Thee calling to

me, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." And when Thou didst on all sides shew me, that what Thou saidst was true, I, convicted by the truth, had nothing at all to answer, but only those dull and drowsy words, "Anon, anon," "presently," "leave me but a little." But "presently, presently" had no present, and my "little while" went on for a long while; in vain I "delighted in Thy law according to the inner man, when another law in my members rebelled against the law of my mind, and led me captive under the law of sin which was in my members."<sup>3</sup>

Failing to pass his medical examinations, and lacking the courage necessary to discuss his affairs with his father, he drifted to London. There, if he wrote no tragedy, he enacted one of the deepest. But the self in him that made for righteousness survived, and although cast for a time among the very lowest, Francis Thompson never ceased to feel himself equal to the highest.

So low did he fall that it was as he writes in one of the "Sister Songs":

Once—in that nightmare-time which still doth haunt  
My dreams, a grim, unbidden visitant—

Forlorn, and faint, and stark,  
I had endured through watches of the dark  
The abashless inquisition of each star,  
Yea, was the outcast mark

Of all those heavenly passers' scrutiny;  
Stood bound and helplessly  
For Time to shoot his barbed minutes at me;  
Suffered the trampling hoof of every hour

In night's slow-wheelèd car;  
Until the tardy dawn dragged me at-length  
From under those dread wheels; and, bled of strength,  
I waited the inevitable last.<sup>4</sup>

God's love never ceased to pursue him. Strangely diverse were the helpers that crossed his path. A kindly Christian bootmaker took him to his home, and gave to the mysterious wanderer not only food, but a home and work. But Francis Thompson proved a failure as a worker. He had grown even more indolent than in the earlier days, for the opium held him with a grip of iron. His benefactor showed great patience with him, but at last, after about four months' service, his hopeless apprentice was dismissed. Again Thompson wandered the streets to suffer an outcast's hunger, and to realize in all its intensity the truth of

<sup>1</sup> E. Meynell, *The Life of Francis Thompson*, 38.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 156.

<sup>3</sup> *The Confessions of S. Augustine*, 156.

<sup>4</sup> *The Works of Francis Thompson*, i. 36.



General Booth's *In Darkest England*. No wonder the review he wrote of it later was a masterly one.

In all literature there is nothing more touching than the story of how he was befriended by a poor unfortunate girl of the streets. Quoting Mr. Meynell's words: 'When the streets were no longer crowded with shameful possibilities, she would think of the only tryst that her heart regarded, and, a sister of charity, would take her beggar into her vehicle at the appointed place and cherish him with an affection maidenly and motherly, and passionate in both these capacities. Two outcasts, they sat marvelling that there were joys for them to unbury and to share.' 'Weakness and confidence, humility and reverence, were gifts unknown to her except at his hands, and she repaid them with graces as lovely as a child's, and as unhesitating as a saint's. Her sacrifice was to fly from him: learning he had found friends, she said that he must go to them and leave her. After his first interview with my father he had taken her his news. "They will not understand our friendship," she said, and then, "I always knew you were a genius." And so she strangled the opportunity; she killed again the child, the sister; the mother had come to life within her—she went away. Without warning she went to unknown lodgings and was lost to him.'<sup>1</sup>

To Mr. and Mrs. Meynell we, in a sense, owe the gift to the world of Francis Thompson the poet. As we read of their rescue of him, and the love and care bestowed upon this 'moth of a man,' it seems natural to believe with James Hinton in the intimate relation of all that happens to the Divine care for us. 'I can see nothing,' he says, 'in all nature but the loving acts of spiritual beings, and know no reason for disbelieving anything that it should be conformable to love to do. It is a glorious world; I do delight in it.'

Mr. and Mrs. Meynell discovered that neither Francis Thompson's happiness, nor his tenderness, nor his sensibility had been marred like his constitution by his experience. 'He will not live,' said the doctor they consulted, 'and you hasten his death by denying his whims and opium.' 'Paganism Old and New,' which led to Mr. Meynell's discovery of him in 1887, was but the beginning of his work. He lived until 1907. Under the direct supervision of his kind guardians he renounced opium, and for the greater part of the years left to him he kept writing for magazines, sometimes prose

papers, but more frequently his wonderful poems. The atmosphere of his poems is that of the world beyond the sun, and the language of them, as distinctive as that of Thomas Carlyle, is startling in its strange and musical fitness. A few years before his death, in very weariness he again took to using the drug; he felt that he could not live without it.

All along he remained the man of the 'divided self.' In those later years, if he spent an evening explaining that last August was hot, but this was hotter, his cry really was, 'Where is my laudanum?' 'Nor,' adds Mr. Meynell, 'was his need only physical, his soul too was crying, "Where is my God, my Maker, who giveth songs in the Night? Who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth, and maketh us wiser than the fowls of Heaven?"' He was the man who in his lodgings in Elgin Avenue called down the kitchen stair for his porridge and his beer, and at the same time the lodger whose prayers the landlady often heard; the poet too who wrote:

The angels keep their ancient places;—  
Turn but a stone and start a wing!  
'Tis ye, 'tis your estrangèd faces,  
That miss the many-splendoured thing.

But when so sad thou canst not sadder  
Cry;—and upon thy so sore loss  
Shall shine the traffic of Jacob's ladder  
Pitched betwixt Heaven and Charing Cross.

Yea, in the night, my Soul, my daughter,  
Cry,—clinging Heaven by the hems;  
And lo, Christ walking on the water  
Not of Genesareth, but Thames!<sup>2</sup>

We would hear what such a man has to say of life as he saw it, whether side by side with children, as he often found himself, or in the company of a pure womanhood. We would know also with what eyes he looked upon Nature, and in doing so we shall discover what were his thoughts about God and His Son Jesus Christ.

## RECENT POETRY.

### Susan Miles.

There does not at first sight seem to be much poetry in *Dunch*, by Susan Miles (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net). But poetry is not according to length of line or law of rhyme. The sense of fellowship is here, and imagination—the imagination that sees the

<sup>1</sup> *The Life of Francis Thompson*, 83.

<sup>2</sup> *The Works of Francis Thompson*, ii, 226.



general in the particular, the significance of the insignificant. The following lines fairly express the character of the book, though there are deeper notes.

## DESPATCHES.

You know everything,  
Or nearly everything.  
You can do everything,  
Or nearly everything.  
At least you know all things that I am conscious  
Of not knowing,  
And can do all things that I would like to do  
And cannot do.  
You are grown up,  
Or nearly grown up,  
For they have cut off your curls,  
And provided you with stockings  
That cover your knees.  
My Mother is sad  
Because your curls are gone.  
She says that they were fine  
And golden,  
And that your head has now  
The appearance of a bullet.  
She says that your knees are dimpled  
And that stockings  
Hide the dimples.  
But I am not sad  
Because your curls are gone,  
Or because your dimples are hidden.  
I am proud and exultant  
Knowing that you are a man,  
Or very nearly a man.  
Are you not five years old?  
And I, being in myself contemptibly young,  
Namely three,  
Am yet of an importance,  
Seeing that I have a brother  
Who is five,  
Whose curls have been cut off,  
Whose knees are covered  
By seemly stockings.

You know everything.  
There can be no doubt of it.  
Our Nurse has taken us to Church.  
We have sat near the back of the Church,  
Behind the school children.  
The Curate has asked strange questions  
And the children have answered them,  
Or have not answered them.  
The Curate has asked,  
'Who was crucified with the Lord Jesus?'  
And you have answered boldly  
And clearly;  
Your voice has rung through the Church  
And caused all the school children  
To turn in their seats

And gaze at you;  
You have answered without a blush,  
Without a tremor,  
'Two thieves.'  
And now we are running home,  
Tugging at Nurse's hands,  
To find Mother  
And tell her what you have done.  
You are all wise,  
All knowing,  
And I, though contemptibly young,  
Namely four,  
Am yet of an importance,  
Seeing that I am, most blessedly,  
Your sister.

And why am I, whose own knees have been  
covered  
With seemly stockings these thirty years,  
Why am I three years old again this morning,  
Or four years old?  
It is because you have been mentioned  
In despatches.

## E. J. Thompson.

Though Mr. E. J. Thompson calls his volume by the homely title of *Walham Thickets* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net), there are in it songs of other lands. Three rivers are well known to him—the Thames, the Hugli, and the Tigris. And there are vivid pictures of them all. Take this of the Indian river:

SEPTEMBER, 1914.

A crescent moon o'erhead;  
Lightning leapt on the water;  
And thought of England's dead  
And my brethren called to slaughter  
Troubled me, as I went  
Over the rain-flushed bent.

Here, it was dusk and dew,  
And dark in heaven's hollow  
The big fruit-foxes flew,  
And the little Indian swallow,  
Poised on the waters grey,  
Dipt and swooped on her prey.

But from where a wind of death  
Through distant fields was blowing  
Came waft of a bitter breath,  
And crimson Hugli's flowing  
I saw, with eyes that swam,  
I, even the ghost I am.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary com-  
munications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings-  
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.